21810

National Library of Canada / Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE / THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/NOM DE L'AUTEUR Ronald C. Holgerson

TITLE OF THESIS/TITRE DE LA THÈSE Shakespeare's The Tempest and the Jacobean Court Masque

UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITÉ University of Alberta

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE M.A.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE DEGRÉ 1974

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE Dr. John Orrell

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/DATÉ Aug 30/74 SIGNED/SIGNÉ R C Holgerson

PERMANENT ADDRESS/RÉSIDENCE FIXE #1-10013-115 Street
Edmonton, Alberta

NL-91 (11-73)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

SHAKESPEARE'S THE TEMPEST AND THE JACOBEAN COURT MASQUE

by

RONALD CHARLES HOLGERSON

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1974

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled

SHAKESPEARE'S THE TEMPEST AND THE JACOBEAN COURT MASQUE

submitted by RONALD CHARLES HOLGERSON

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS.

J. Orrell
Supervisor

Linda T. Fitz

James V. DeFelice

Date 20th August 1974

ABSTRACT

The Tempest, by William Shakespeare, was presented before the Jacobean court on the evening of 1 November 1611, in the Whitehall Banqueting House. This thesis, after an analysis of the requirements of Shakespeare's text, attempts to establish the theatrical environment and staging conditions under which The Tempest was performed. At the same time, Shakespeare's purpose in writing a play for masque-like production is explored, and certain passages are explicated in the light of Shakespeare's experience with Renaissance theatre technology.

Chapter One introduces the argument that Shakespeare wrote The Tempest as a result of his awareness of the principles of the Jacobean court masque. Chapter Two reviews the English masque tradition, examines the Whitehall Banqueting House as a theatre, and analyzes the new techniques of Renaissance scenic design adapted by Inigo Jones to the Jacobean court masque. Chapter Three involves a detailed comparison between The Tempest and several of the masques, in terms of their staging by Jones, in order to establish what sort of costumes, sound effects, and scenery might have been a part of the 1611 production of the play. Chapter Four is a study of the banquet-table scene, the betrothal masque, and the discovery at chess, three special moments in the play's theatrical art which reinforce the argument for a masque-like production. Chapter Five links Prospero to theatre designer Inigo Jones and magician-scientist John Dee, in order to suggest that Shakespeare rejects the extravagant spectacle of masques as a form of theatre along with the occult powers of his hero. Thus, it is argued, Shakespeare puts theatrical art into ethical perspective. Chapter

Six concludes that the theme of The Tempest as presented in the Whitehall Banqueting House on the evening of 1 November 1611 was the true and unadorned beauty of mankind.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
CHAPTER ONE: ART TO ENCHANT	1
CHAPTER TWO: GORGEOUS PALACES	8
CHAPTER THREE: A TEMPESTUOUS NOISE	31
CHAPTER FOUR: A MOST MAJESTIC VISION	57
CHAPTER FIVE: PROSPERO THE PRIME DUKE	74
CHAPTER SIX: NO MORE AMAZEMENT	90
FOOTNOTES	93
BIBLIOGRAPHY	110

CHAPTER ONE: ART TO ENCHANT

> Hallowmas nyght was presented att Whithall before y^e^ Kinges Ma^tie^ a play called the Tempest.[1]

On the evening of November 1, 1611, King James I of England and his court witnessed a production of Shakespeare's The Tempest in the Banqueting House at Whitehall. Eleven months before, on January 1, 1611, Inigo Jones had elaborately staged one of his most spectacular masques to date, Oberon, The Fairy Prince, by Ben Jonson. A massive proscenium arch, lavish costumes, and perspective scenery which "changed" thrice were among the many elements designed to satisfy the expectations of the noble gathering. This thesis argues that The Tempest as originally produced at court made a similar appeal to the accustomed tastes of its private and intimate audience. A comparison

will be made between the requirements of the text of The Tempest and the staging of several masques in order to suggest that Shakespeare had written a play for presentation before his sovereign, and, of necessity and design, had prepared a script requiring dignity and spectacle in its presentation. An attempt will be made to persuade the reader that The Tempest was created by a Shakespeare fully acquainted with the innovations in theatrical design introduced by Inigo Jones after 1605.

The ensuing discussion will begin with a brief outline of the basic elements of the English masque tradition. The contribution of Vitruvius and Serlio to this tradition will be assessed in terms of the interpretation of Renaissance theories by John Dee and the application of these theories by Inigo Jones. A brief description of the Whitehall Banqueting House theatre is included in order to clearly establish the theatrical environment in which The Tempest was staged on 1 November 1611. The play itself must then be examined in the light of the type of scenery, machinery, music, dancing, costumes, and special effects expected in court productions, especially those designed for the Whitehall Banqueting House. Certain textual passages become clearer once a background in the technology of the 1611 court stage has been established. Ultimately the figure of Prospero may be revealed as not only a magician-father-ruler, but also a Renaissance scientist concerned with theatrical art.

The foundation for all discussion, however, must lie with the acceptance of certain details concerning Shakespeare's intent and the date of the play. The latter presents no real problem. Frank Kermode, after a concise analysis of source material, argues that the play was

written after 1610, and concludes in his "Introduction" to the Arden edition that "although a vast amount has been written about the termini of The Tempest, it is one of the plays whose early stage history is relatively simple, and supported by external testimony. Since the authenticity of the Revels Accounts which Cunningham claimed to have found in 1842 is no longer seriously in doubt, we can be certain that it was presented at Court in 1611 by Shakespeare's company."[2] Kermode suggests that 1 November 1611 need not have been the first production date for the play, but documents are lacking to prove a court presentation before this date. If The Tempest is to be studied from the point of view of contemporary theatrical design theory, then only that technology available before that particular date may be deemed acceptable and relevant.

While The Tempest as a whole cannot be dated precisely, the betrothal masque (IV,i) offers its own peculiar problems and has been subjected to particular investigation concerning its date of composition. Several critics consider it an interpolation of 1613, when the play was performed in celebration of the marriage of James's daughter Elizabeth to the Elector Palatine. E.M.W. Tillyard[3] and E.K. Chambers[4] both agree, however, on the integrity of the text as a unit, and Frank Kermode refutes those who would call it in question by affirming that "entertainments of this kind were not uncommon in the professional plays of the period," and that the "'masque' is a betrothal-'masque', of course, and Ferdinand and Miranda are the contractors celebrated."[5] It is likely, then, that Shakespeare drew on the general masque tradition for his drama, and did not write his play for any particular historical wedding. Indeed his masque is so integral a part of The

Tempest's structure that its presence in the 1611 court performance may have been understood by the Jacobean audience as the culmination of a series of dramatic special effects occurring beforehand. The Tempest must be accepted as an entity complete in itself, not radically different, if at all, from the 1623 folio version history possesses.

If the date of composition and integrity of the play may be agreed upon, there remains, however, one further crucial issue. Did Shakespeare intend The Tempest for court production and did he write it accordingly? The problem is a difficult one to resolve, but critics have argued that the play's unique qualities suggest that he did. Henry James asserted of The Tempest in 1907 that "the suggestion that it was addressed, in its brevity, its rich simplicity, and its free elegance, to court-production, and above all to providing, with a string of other dramas, for the 'intellectual' splendour of a wedding-feast, is, when once entertained, not easily dislodged."[6] The particularity of the occasion aside, James appears to have understood the unique suitability of the play to court theatrical conditions. Ashley Thorndike referred to The Tempest as a "poem," which "on the Elizabethan stage must have seemed largely an effort to satisfy the craving for spectacular novelties."[7] Ernest Law, in "Shakespeare at Whitehall," considered that since "upwards of a hundred performances of his [Shakespeare's] plays must have taken place during his lifetime at Whitehall Palace...it is obvious how considerable must have been the influences of these performances both on Shakespeare and his art."[8] M.C. Bradbrook, speaking generally of Shakespeare's plays, suggested that "the playwright would probably have to reckon beforehand on the possibility of his play being given in a Court setting,"[9] and T.S.

Graves, speaking of Shakespeare's company, maintained that "it is certainly to be expected that they should have taken advantage of their experiences at court."[10] J. Isaacs affirmed of Shakespeare that "there is hardly a detail in the evolution of the theatre of his time with which he is not familiar."[11] Certainly Shakespeare was at least very well acquainted with the public and private theatres of London, including the Whitehall Banqueting House which provided the court with a stage for plays and masques.

Gerald Bentley wrote in 1964 that "Elizabethan dramatists almost always knew" what particular theatres their plays would be performed in, and that "this foreknowledge characterized Elizabethan playwrights in general, for their plays were usually written to order."[12] Would Shakespeare have been any less aware? Certainly by 1611 his plays were being performed in both the public Globe theatre and the private Blackfriars theatre, as well as at court. Evidence will be presented to support the suggestion that Shakespeare was writing The Tempest knowing that eventually it might be produced for the court in the Whitehall Banqueting House.

C.M. Haines maintained that there is a "considerable elaboration of stage-effect in several of the last plays, particularly the Tempest and Henry VIII."[13] G. Wilson Knight agreed that "visual details concerning the action are not emphasized, as a rule, by stage-direction, except in the latest group of plays; and then only with moderation."[14] D.J. Palmer concluded that "The Tempest as a whole shows the influence on Shakespeare's dramatic techniques of the Court Masque, a form of private entertainment which reached new heights of splendour and lavishness under James I, who was more extravagant, and whose queen was more

enthusiastic, than his predecessor in promoting such shows at royal expense. The emphasis of the masques upon music and spectacle, and their use of improbable setting and supernatural figures, are reflected in Shakespeare's play."[15] Enid Welsford, in The Court Masque, argues that "The Tempest was influenced not only by the masque in general, but by certain masques in particular,"[16] and goes on to point out similarities between Shakespeare's play and Jonson's Hymenai. John Russell Brown offers one more clue as to why The Tempest "might have been written for court performance, to be acted against scenery like that used for earlier and later masques," informing his reader that "James Maxwell, the Gentleman Usher in charge of the Banqueting House, had spent six days with nine of his assistants preparing for the three plays"[17] presented at Whitehall in November, 1611, of which The Tempest was one. This wealth of critical opinion serves to refute the statements of Glynne Wickham with regards to Shakespeare and the court masques, remarks somewhat supported by previous comments by critics such as William Poel.[18] Wickham insists concerning changeable scenery and extravagant production that "Shakespeare witnessed the early attempts in this direction in the last ten years of his life, but neither he nor any of his fellow actors attempted to copy it,"[19] and that any affirmation to the contrary reeks of "absurdity."[20]

The necessary hypotheses which form a basis for the argument that Shakespeare wrote The Tempest with the Jacobean court masque before his mind's eye have thus already been established by others. It may now be reasonably assumed that Shakespeare wrote The Tempest for presentation in 1611, and that he knew his play might be performed in the Banqueting House at Whitehall. The raw materials for a study of

The Tempest as a consequence of Shakespeare's experience with the masque must be sought in the masque tradition, the art of Renaissance scenic design and theatrical effect, the architectural nature of the theatre involved, and the innovative experiments conducted by Inigo Jones before 1 November 1611.

CHAPTER TWO: GORGEOUS PALACES

A study of The Tempest suggests that many of its production requirements were remarkably similar to those of the Jacobean court masque. Before analyzing the text of Shakespeare's play in order to determine the nature of its theatrical necessities, however, we must establish essential connections between English verbal and Italian visual expression. This requires a review of the English masque as an art form, a comparison between masque and play production at court, and a brief outline of the technology available to producers of entertainments intended to please a king and his royal following. Finally an argument which links The Tempest to the masque and its staging will be constructed.

The early Tudor masque was mostly dance, with little dialogue and even less dramatic conflict. Often the only words spoken were a

few of introduction by a "Masque Presenter." Having developed from the medieval "mumming" and "disguising,"[1] masques were most frequently performed as a part of holiday celebrations. By 1611, the masque was firmly established as a major form of court entertainment during festive seasons, along with dances, feasts, and plays. The court of King James I came not only to watch, but also to take part. The climax of the masque occurred when the courtiers were invited to join the masquers in dancing. When the lords and ladies began to dance, however, the distinction between masquer and courtier blurred amidst the equal splendour of gorgeous costumes and splendid gowns.

The social and political importance of the masque entertainment encouraged its development into a lavish display of scenery and costume. Henry VII instituted the position of an Abbot or Lord of Misrule, whose duty was to preside over the various diversions planned for the holiday season. The Lord of Misrule was assisted by the Master of the Revels, who organized the more practical part of the business, providing players' garments, masks, stage-properties, and scenic devices.[2] The Lord of Misrule became obsolete under Henry VIII and his successors, and by 1592 the Master of the Revels was solely responsible for the licensing and provision of royal entertainment, answerable only to the Lord Chamberlain.[3] The court could afford to spend much more on its amusements than the citizens could on their public theatres, which were financed through admission fees. No fee was charged at the royal palace, but as the masque increased in social importance, the necessary support was supplied by the King with little hesitation. James I's wife, Queen Anne, and sons, Henry and Charles, participated directly in the production and performance of masques at court. This very royal

entertainment became a focal point of international diplomatic relations as the French and Spanish ambassadors vied for place as the king's chief guest at the masque.[4] As Paul Reyher says: "Le devoir du souverain est de divertir sa cour sous peine de perdre de son prestige; plus les fêtes sont splendides, plus la cour est brillante, et plus haute est l'idée que se font les sujets, surtout les ambassadeurs étrangers, de la grandeur du prince, de la prosperité et de la puissance du royaume."[5] The need for innovation and elaborateness in the masque was thus dictated in part by its social and political relevance to court life and honour. Enid Welsford sums the matter up: "the theme of the court masque was always the same at bottom; it was the theme of social harmony, the glorification of marriage as a social function, the idealization of a united nation under a strong centralized government."[6]

Under the Tudors, however, this theme was very superficially handled in the masques. The emphasis was on visual elements rather than on any literary quality. The balance was redressed under the Stuarts by Ben Jonson, who contributed eloquent language, dramatic conflict, and motivation to the masque, which then began to lose its frivolous atmosphere. The content of the masque evolved from a simplistic but serious enactment of the theme of social harmony to a more complex expression of that harmony in conflict with disorder and chaos. Shakespeare, Ben Jonson's friend and Blackfriars colleague, used the masque as part of several of his plays. Act Four, scene one of The Tempest, while brief, was certainly meant to evoke the elements of the masque.

The conflict which became an essential part of the masque was introduced by Jonson in the joining together of masque and antimasque.

The antimasque was meant to embody the chaos, disorder, and misrule which conflicted with the principles of order and harmony of the masque proper. More often than not, the antimasque was comic, yet, as Welsford puts it, "the poet who desired to achieve artistic unity and at the same time to gratify his employers, had to keep foolery in strict bounds," for "misrule had to be shown as the foe and moreover the vanquished foe."[7] The beauty of the masque as spectacle, and the theme of order, were set off by the usually grotesque quality of the staged antimasque.[8] The stately-costumed gods, goddesses, kings, and queens triumphed over actors dressed like beasts. The slow "measures" and quicker "galliards" and "corantos," which musically demonstrated the order of the masque environment,[9] were vastly superior to the acrobatics of the "antic dance" of the antimasque. Ben Jonson's greatest contribution to the masque was, nevertheless, his poetry, which eloquently defined the thematic order and the principle of social harmony. Jonson thus united the theatre of the word basic to the constitution of England's drama with the visual delights of the masque.

Jonson did not succeed, however, in dominating the masque with his language, for the Jacobean audience insisted on its right to be seduced by spectacle and music.[10] The Tudor masques were visually splendid because of elaborate costumes and emblematic scenic devices, such as vividly decorated pageant cars, triumphal arches, and so on. The Stuart masques, beginning with Inigo Jones's production of Jonson's Masque of Blackness in 1605, were even more appealing to the eye, as scenic backdrops, decorated proscenium arches, and wonderful stage machinery made their appearance. However, before examining the theatrical technology which afforded the Jacobean masque specifically

much beauty and grotesquerie, it is necessary to identify the source of that technology as one combining both Italian and English theory.

The court theatres of Renaissance Italy derived much of their technology from the De Architectura of Vitruvius,[11] an Augustan Roman architect, whose writings were published in Latin in 1486 and in Italian in 1521, and from the D'Architettura of the Renaissance Italian Sebastiano Serlio,[12] the last volume of which was published in 1547. Both treatises rely heavily on mathematical principles. Vitruvius concerns himself more with the architectural basics of theatre construction, such as acoustical difficulties and the relationship of stage to audience, than with the actual staging of plays, but does distinguish between the designs for tragic, comic, and satiric scenes. Serlio fills in the gaps with his detailed plans and sketches for these scenes, all of which consist of a flat rectangular apron before a raked stage floor, upon which is situated a series of frame and canvas houses, the entire vision receding in geometric perspective to a painted backcloth continuing the realistic illusion. The Serlian scene was usually arranged at one end of a hall, directly opposite the seat of the Italian duke for whom the entertainment had been ordered. The focus for all the scenic arrangement originated at the ducal throne, which provided the most correct position from which to view the elaborate perspective design. Inigo Jones's designs for royal entertainments at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1605, conformed with this principle,[13] as did those for masques at the Whitehall Banqueting House in the years that followed, the focus being, of course, the royal seat of James I.

It is commonly acknowledged that England managed to delay the Renaissance. However, as early as 1563 Vitruvian and Serlian theories

were being incorporated into English writing on architecture. John Shute's First and Chief Grovndes of Architectvre was published in that year, and includes references to Vitruvius and Serlio. Shute had studied in Italy in 1550, having been sent over by the Duke of Northumberland.[14] Seven years after the publication of Shute's treatise, in 1570, John Dee published an influential work in the form of a Preface to Henry Billingsley's translation of Euclid.[15] Dee includes specific references to both Vitruvius and Serlio, citing which book and chapter might be consulted for further enlightenment on what he is saying. The ideas of Vitruvius and Serlio thus were available in English to Shakespeare and his colleagues right from the beginning -- even before the construction, in 1576, of the Theatre by Burbadge. In 1611, under the supervision of Robert Peske, Serlio's architectural treatise was translated into English. The year 1611 becomes a very important one in the history of English theatre, with this translation, Jones's designs for Jonson's Oberon, and the production of The Tempest. Finally, in 1617, Dee's philosophical successor, Robert Fludd, published his Utriusque Cosmi Historia, which included much Vitruvian and Serlian theory, and which Frances Yates considers to have been in the writing from 1605 onwards.[16] The stages of Renaissance Italy, with their new Vitruvian design and Serlian scenic principles, were accessible to the Jacobean dramatists, through the writings of Shute, Dee, and Fludd, and the translation of Serlio.

Inigo Jones's awareness of Italian methods could very easily have begun, then, long before his first trip to Italy, in about 1600. Yates concludes that "it was in the tradition of the Vitruvian subjects, established in England by John Dee at least as early as 1570, and

continued in a direct line from Dee by Fludd, with improved mechanical techniques and emphasis on perspective, that Inigo Jones would have found his experts."[17] The influence of these Hermetic scientists would have been augmented by Jones's association with Prince Henry's surveyor, Salomon de Caus, a philosopher, garden-architect, and hydraulic engineer. Yates defines the Hermetic influence in several of her books, concluding in The Rosicrucian Enlightenment that Jones and de Caus "were versed in those accomplishments which Vitruvius recommends as necessary for the true architect to know, the arts and sciences based on number and proportion, music, perspective, painting, mechanics, and the like,"[18]

Jones applied his art and science to the staging of the court masque. As Yates suggests, Jones's theatre technology, due to the accumulated influences of his knowledge of Shute, Dee, Fludd, and de Caus, plus his own voyages to Italy, was a development of Vitruvian and Serlian theories. John McDowell asserts that Italian techniques would "appeal only to a person with a background both scientific and imaginative," adding that "Inigo Jones had both these qualities, and Court staging under his supervision broke from medieval tradition and established the complete form of the illusionistic perspective stage."[19] Because of the superior nature of Jones's efforts, the theatre of the spoken word was in danger of being usurped at court by the theatre of visual illusion, much to the chagrin of Ben Jonson. Certainly a transition from emblematic to image staging was in process.

What relationship was there between Shakespeare and Italian stage techniques as introduced into the English drama through Dee, Fludd, and Jones? Glynne Wickham remarks that "Shakespeare was fortunate not

to have lived so long as his great rival [Jonson], for it is hard to see how he could have adapted his interpretation of dramatic art to conform with the new Italian tenets of landscape art which Jones had successfully championed into the life of the English theatre."[20] The difficulty does not exist. Lily B. Campbell asserts that "it is well to remember that Burbadge, 'the first builder of theatres,' was not only a carpenter and builder (performing thus the function of the architect) but was something of an artist as well. It would be strange indeed if a man of Burbadge's interests did not know something of Vitruvian theories and of Continental opinion in regard to theatrical architecture."[21] Frances Yates suggests that Burbadge was one of a group of joiners influenced by Dee's Preface and the Vitruvian subjects, and argues that the Theatre erected in 1576 was based on the Vitruvius-Dee science.[22] Yates also suggests the second Globe was influenced by the Hermetic art of memory as interpreted by Fludd.[23] Shakespeare could hardly have failed to have been influenced by the prevailing stage technology of his day, much of which was derived from the writings of Vitruvius and Serlio. Yates asserts that "this is the moment in the history of the theatre when the powerful original movement is affected, in imagination at least, by the increased magic of the production."[24] An examination of The Tempest in the following chapters will reveal that Shakespeare was sensitive to that magic.

Of course masques were not the only dramatic entertainments at court. There were ordinary plays as well, many of them acted by Shakespeare's company of players. There were at least two alternatives available to the King's Men for producing plays at court, one old, one new. The new was to try to create the same atmosphere of illusion as

the masques, through the use of scenic backdrops, stage lighting, music, and elaborate costumes, all deployed on a raised platform erected at one end of the hall serving as a theatre. Stephen Orgel, speaking of Jones's experiments at Oxford in 1605, where he produced four plays for James I and his court, emphasizes the special nature of this form of presentation, asserting that Serlian stages "were employed only at court or when royalty was present; they were not used in the public or private playhouses." Furthermore, "Jones's stage subtly changed the character of both plays and masques by transforming audiences into spectators."[25] The old was to create a symbolic scene through the use of traditional emblematic devices arranged about the floor in the centre of the hall. Leslie Hotson, in The First Night of Twelfth Night, reconstructs in detail an emblematic staging for Shakespeare's Twelfth Night.[26]

There are three reasons for suggesting that a masque-like technique of production was sometimes used for plays at court. First, there is the prestige of the masques themselves. It may be argued that since beautiful emblematic devices, lavish costumes, and music were always a part of the King's Men's efforts, even at the public theatres, a lack of perspective scenery and stage lighting would not really matter at court. However, in the interior space lighting was essential, and the most effective stage lighting could occur only in one concentrated area, such as on the raised stage at one end of the hall. The new Serlian lighting techniques, designed for perspective scenery, were a part of the Whitehall Banqueting House equipment, as will be shown. A dispersed setting in the middle of the hall would have been very difficult to light because of the inadequacies of the

lamps and the multiplicity of focus. Many plays had been produced at court in this manner before the advent of new lighting technology, but the royal audience certainly must have preferred the improved lighting of the masques and it would be strange had the King's Men not used it to their advantage.

Second, there is the prestige of the Jacobean Court itself. Stephen Orgel points out that

> through the use of perspective the monarch, always the ethical centre of court productions, became in a physical and emblematic way the centre as well. Jones's theatre transformed its audience into a living and visible emblem of the aristocratic hierarchy: the closer one sat to the King, the 'better' one's place was, and only the King's seat was perfect. It is no accident that the perspective stages flourished at court and only at court, and that their appearance there coincided with the reappearance in England of the Divine Right of Kings as a serious political philosophy.[27]

Surely, even if emblematic devices rather than perspective scenes were used, they occupied a stage at one end of the Banqueting Hall, so as not to disrupt the perfection of such a seating arrangement, common for masque entertainments after 1605.

Third, as theatrical businessmen, the King's men must have realized the need for new innovations in staging, innovations that would ensure popular acceptance. It may be argued that the masque was a different form of dramatic art, but definite scenic parallels, such as those effected by cloud machines, existed in both plays and masques. The King's Men, having to create special effects, would have learned to use the new Serlian techniques, as improvements on the old methodology. With the acquisition of Blackfriars, they possessed their own indoor

theatre, one not unlike the court hall, an interior space requiring lighting, one capable of the effective use of scenery and the proscenium arch. In order to attract their audience, they must have had to exploit the new technology.[28] The reasons for suggesting a masque-like production of plays at court will become more persuasive when the staging requirements demanded by Shakespeare's text for The Tempest are discussed.

The alternative to such a production of plays at court is most carefully presented by Leslie Hotson, who argues that Shakespeare's Twelfth Night was presented before Elizabeth at Whitehall Palace, January 6, 1600, in the centre of the Great Hall. He suggests that two mansions, representing Orsino's and Olivia's houses, were placed facing east and west, opposite each other, on the floor in an arena-like stage area, and includes an illustration with a bench and a potted tree.[29] Although there must have been some inconvenience for spectators seated immediately behind these two structures, Hotson's argument is persuasive and sound, for the time and place concerned. However the eleven years following this production marked the beginning of a new era. Not only had James replaced Elizabeth, but also Inigo Jones had revolutionized production techniques. Furthermore, Hotson insists that Twelfth Night was produced in the Great Hall of the palace, and dismisses the Tudor Banqueting House, built in 1581, as "Elizabeth's wooden 'dancing barn'...built for masques and banquets, and the Queen does not use it for plays."[30] James obviously used the Banqueting House, reconstructed in 1606, for plays, along with masques, banquets, and dancing. The Tempest was one of several plays performed in this very place. Hotson's alternative becomes much less probable for the

year 1611.

Glynne Wickham, in Early English Stages, argues that a great change in production techniques is evidenced between 1604 and 1605, while considering the differences between the staging of Samuel Daniel's The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses (1604) and Jonson's Masque of Blackness (1605). He suggests that the former employed a strictly emblematic scenic arrangement, with the necessary "Temple of Peace," "Cave of Sleep," and "Mountain" being dispersed about the centre of the floor, whereas the latter demonstrates "Jones's redistribution of the scene in accordance with the principles of optical science."[31] Wickham, like Hotson, is aware that between 1605 and 1611 staging techniques became sophisticated, so that, for example, scene changes were effected in the 1611 production of Jonson's Oberon. However neither thinks that Shakespeare might have created plays for the new environment. Wickham particularly insists that Shakespeare's theatre of the word was not susceptible to corruption by the quest for realistic illusion. He admits "that the scenic spectacle of the Mask was a means through which artists and spectators could both experiment," but expresses the feeling that "the subjection of dramatist and actor to the dictates of the architect and painter" is "a serious distortion of the nature of dramatic art."[32] However, by 1611 the new technology was still very much in the experimental stage, and Jonson and Jones were still friendly collaborators. Certainly Shakespeare would not have been so conservative as to reject outright the new developments in theatrical art. Indeed, The Tempest may be read as Shakespeare's critical statement on the increased magic of production, as we shall see in later chapters. It must be agreed, at least, that the new technology, based on Vitruvius and Serlio,

was available to plays at court. Subsequent argument will suggest that Shakespeare chose to exploit it.

The most important factors surrounding the first production of The Tempest are the year, 1611, because of the developments in stage technology up to that date, and the place, the Whitehall Banqueting House, because of its particular appropriateness to masque productions. There were three "Banqueting Houses" existing at various times during the reign of James I.[33] The original Elizabethan Banqueting House, built in 1581, measured 110 feet in length and 50 feet in width. In 1605, for Jonson's Masque of Blackness, a stage measuring 40 feet square and 4 feet high was constructed, mounted on wheels, which allowed it to advance and be joined with another, more firmly grounded. One stage provided the acting area, the second, placed in front of the first, was used for dancing.

In 1606, James ordered the reconstruction of the old Elizabethan structure for the production of masques.[34] Thus emerged the first Jacobean Banqueting House, which measured only slightly larger than the Elizabethan one, being 120 feet long and 53 feet wide. The same double stage as was constructed in the Elizabethan Banqueting House was used in the Jacobean for Campion's Lord Hay's Masque of 1607.[35] Orazio Busino, chaplain to the Venetian ambassador, described the building in 1618, before its destruction by fire on January 12, 1619, asserting that the hall was arranged like a theatre:

> The most distinguished of the masques is performed on the day after the feast of the three wise men, in accordance with an ancient custom of this royal palace, where in a large hall arranged like a theatre, with well-secured boxes all around, the stage is placed at one end, and facing it at the other end, his majesty's chair under a large canopy,

> and near him stools for the foreign ambassadors....While waiting for the King we took pleasure in admiring the decorations, in observing the beauty of the hall, with two orders of columns one on top of the other, their distance from the wall the full width of the passage, the upper gallery supported by Doric columns, and above these the Ionic, which hold up the roof of the hall. It is all of wood, including even the pillars, carved and gilded with great skill.[36]

Ernest Law, in Shakespeare's Tempest as Originally Produced at Court, reconstructs the first Jacobean Banqueting House as having a stage 40 feet square and standing 3 feet high. Law asserts that "it seems to have had sides of solid partitions and something of a proscenium also; and being thus -- unlike the open-air theatres -- detached from the audience, which sat entirely in front of it, it must have afforded full scope for scenic illusion and the presentment of 'tableaux' on a scale and in a setting of unprecedented splendor."[37] Law finds the stage "in every way suitable for the presentation of such a play as The Tempest, with its frequent spectacular effects."[38]

Glynne Wickham, in Early English Stages II, Part Two, offers a reconstruction of the Whitehall Banqueting House, based on a ground-plan sketch by John Smythson, drawn in 1618, before the fire that destroyed the court theatre.[39] The House, 120' X 53', extended from a vestibule at the southern end of the hall to a pillar-supported gallery, 16' deep, at the northern end. Ten pillars on either side of the hall supported the gallery mentioned by Busino. Wickham asserts that "the King's State was placed at the upper (southern) end of the hall, degrees (tiered, scaffold seating) down the two sides leaving passages clear behind, and the stage at the lower (northern) end." Remembering the stage erected for Jonson's Masque of Blackness, Wickham concludes that

a stage forty feet square by four feet high

> would have been exactly accommodated between the outer edges of the pillars on the eastern and western sides and would have projected into the hall to one third of its full length. Clearly we cannot be sure of this; but what is certain is that the four pillars supporting the gallery at the northern (stage) end provided three openings or doorways each of which was ten feet wide. The closing of these doors or spaces would create a convenient tiring-house beneath the gallery and the two staircases at the extremities of this recessed space would provide equally convenient access to the gallery above. To convert this stage from one for plays into one for Masks it was only necessary to install a temporary proscenium arch spanning the width of the hall and to place the Serlian ...cloths behind it.[40]

Wickham's reconstruction, except for the distinction he insists on making between play and masque production, would appear sound and acceptable, especially in the light of Busino's account. It is on this stage, forty feet square, erected at the northern end of the first Jacobean Whitehall Banqueting House, with a tiring room behind the pillars supporting the gallery, and a proscenium arch near the front of the stage (as Law suggests), that Shakespeare's The Tempest was produced on the evening of 1 November 1611.

The Banqueting House's stage boards were seldom left untrodden during the festive season. Inigo Jones produced the following masques by Ben Jonson there: Masque of Blackness in 1605, Hymenai in 1606, Masque of Beauty in 1608, Masque of Queens in 1609, and Oberon in 1611. Jonson's Lord Haddington's Masque of 1608 and Samuel Daniel's Tethys' Festival of 1610 were also important Whitehall productions, though their exact venue cannot be ascertained.[41] The masques were made particularly enchanting on the stage by the use of lighting, music, machines, and

scenery. A brief examination of the theatre technology common to the masques provides a basis for suggesting the conditions under which The Tempest may have been presented in 1611.

Lighting, of course, was the first prerequisite for a theatrical performance in the Whitehall Banqueting House, one shared by the King's Men at Blackfriars. Performances at Whitehall occurred in the evening,[42] not during the day as at the open-air Globe, though the indoor theatre required artificial lighting in any case. Candles were the chief source of light. Serlian technique involved the use of bottles filled with various coloured liquids, which were placed in front of candles or lamps to create special lighting effects. In the Peak translation, Serlio speaks of colours such as "Celestiall blew," "Emerauld," and "Rubbie," and goes on to describe "the manner to set these shining collours in their places," by the use of holes cut in the scenery and boards upon which to set the bottles. He mentions "glasse of all collours" and advises that "you may also place certaine candlestickes aboue the Scene with great candles therein, and aboue the candlesticks you may place some vessels with water, wherein you may put a piece of Camphir, which burning, will show a very good light, and smell well."[43] Allardyce Nicoll concludes that

> all the evidence that remains convinces us that the system of lighting which Inigo Jones employed was based fundamentally upon this Italian practice. How closely the London stage followed the Florentine and Mantuan is shown by the references to those globes...'Glasses for y^e^ Rocke' were ordered in 1609, as a manuscript note on the back of one of [Jones's] Chatsworth designs testifies. More specific allusion is made to them in the Entertainment at Theobalds [1607]: in the 'lararium' of that masque 'were placed diuers Diaphanall glasses, fill'd with seuerall waters that shew'd like so many stones of orient and transparent hiewes.'[44]

Ernest Law suggests that such lighting techniques were used in 1611 for The Tempest, and is of the opinion that, "in view, perhaps, of this very production, and that of The Winter's Tale four days after, there was a complete renovation of all the lighting arrangements of the theatre at a cost equivalent to about £400 at the present day."[45] While it may not be the case that renovations were made specifically for The Tempest production, the nature of the renovations may well have accorded with Serlian technology. In any case, the scene had to be well lit,[46] and the equipment used for lighting masques must have been available to plays for that reason.

The lighting revealed first of all to the gathered courtiers, foreign dignitaries, and royalty, the carpeted dancing area in front of the stage proper and the proscenium arch, the scenery itself being hidden by a front curtain painted in perspective with a symbolic design or the opening scene.[47] William Trumbull the Elder described the opening performance of Oberon thus: "The new hall of the palace was furnished as usual with its galleries round about, a green carpet on the floor, a dais at the top [southern end] for the king and queen. At the bottom [northern end] a very large curtain painted with the kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland....When their Majesties entered accompanied by the princess and the ambassadors of Spain and Venice, flageolets played and the curtain was drawn."[48] Allardyce Nicoll asserts that "between 1606, when the 'scene' was 'drawn' in Jonson's Hymenai, and 1615, when 'a travers was drawne at y^e^ lower end of the hall' for Browne's Masque, there were some dozen allusions to this method of revealing the scene."[49] The curtain appears to have been an essential part of masque productions in the Whitehall Banqueting House,

designed specifically to hide the elaborate scenery behind. The possible nature of a front curtain for The Tempest will be discussed later.

Music was, of course, an essential part of masque production. The use of the "flageolets" as the curtain was drawn for Oberon marks but one instance of many where music was used to herald the drawing or fall of the curtain. Nicoll asserts that "similar flourishes were introduced to accompany scenic changes within the shows themselves," perhaps "to distract the attention of the audience while a change of scene was being effected."[50] Music was needed to accompany the songs and dances which characterized the masque form. The musicians infrequently appeared onstage; more often they were concealed offstage or behind the final scene. One musician in particular is relevant to a study of The Tempest. Robert Johnson provided music for several masques, receiving £20 for having composed dancing music for Jonson's Oberon, and £20 further for furnishing an orchestra of twenty lutes for the Prince's dance contained there[51]. Shakespeare's songs in The Tempest, "'Where the bee sucks,' and 'Full fadom five,' were printed in Dr. John Wilson's collection of Cheerfull Ayres or Ballads (1659) in versions attributed to Robert Johnson."[52] Johnson's music was also used by the King's Men in their own theatres.[53] Perhaps a music characteristic of masques was used in The Tempest. It is important to note that the cost of the 1611 production must have included Johnson's fee.

Special visual effects added startling and spectacular visions to the lavish atmosphere of masques in the Whitehall Banqueting House. Cloud machines which opened and descended to reveal divinities were

especially popular. Thunder and lightning were frequently required. Serlio provided the Jacobean stage with a specific procedure for effecting a stormy atmosphere:

> Sometime you shall haue occasion to shew thunder and lightning as the play requireth; then you must make thunder in this manner: commonly all Scenes are made at the end of a great Hall, whereas vsually there is a Chamber aboue it, wherein you must roule a great Bullet of a Cannon or of some other great Ordinance, and then counterfeit Thunder. Lightning must be made in this maner, there must be a man placed behind the Scene or Scaffold in a high place with a boxe in his hand, the couer whereof must be full with holes, and in the middle of that place there shall be a burning candle placed, the boxe must be filled with powder of vernis or sulphire, and casting his hand with the boxe vpwards the powder flying in the candle, will shew as if it were lightning. But touching the beames of the lightning, you must draw a piece of wire ouer the Scene, which must hang downewards, whereon you must put a Squib couered ouer with pure gold or shining sattin which you will: and while the Bullet is rouling, you must shoote of some piece of Ordinance, and with the same giuing fire to the squibs, it will worke the effect which is desired.[54]

The Whitehall Banqueting House was particularly suited to Serlio's formula: the stage was at one end of the hall, and the gallery above could easily have accommodated the rolling cannon ball. The thunder and lightning which furnish the "tempestuous noise" at the opening of The Tempest were probably effected in the Serlian manner. The play includes several special effects, which will be dealt with in more detail in the succeeding chapter.

The lighting, music, and special effects were all centred, in Jones's masque productions, on the elaborate scenery which provided a background for the dancing and acting. The grouping, on a bare stage,

of various emblematic structures had been replaced by two forms of changeable scenery which provided concentrated settings: the 'periaktoi' or 'machina versatilis' and the 'scena ductilis.' The former involved a prism-like structure, a triangular frame upon a revolving platform, which permitted a change of scene when turned. This form of scene change was used for Jonson's Hymenai and Masque of Queens, and for Daniel's Tethys' Festival.[55] The 'scena ductilis' involved a series of frame and canvas flats set in grooves constructed on the stage floor. Usually two flats joined at the middle were set in a single groove, parting to reveal another scene within. There were no wing or shutter flats at this time, only a series of 'back' scenes.

Jones's designs for Oberon involved three pairs of flats, two of which opened, for a total of three scenes. Jonson's text provides a description of the three backdrops:

> [Scene I:] The first face of the scene appeared all obscure, and nothing perceived but a dark rock with trees beyond it and all wildness that could be presented; till at one corner of the cliff, above the horizon, the moon began to show, and rising, a satyr was seen by her light to put forth his head and call.[56]
>
> [Scene II:] There the whole scene opened, and within was discovered the frontispiece of a bright and glorious palace whose gates and walls were transparent. Before the gates lay two sylvans, armed with their clubs and dressed in leaves, asleep.[57]
>
> [Scene III:] There the whole palace opened, and the nation of fays were discovered, some with instruments, some bearing lights, others singing; and within, afar off in perspective, the knights masquers sitting in their several sieges. At the further end of all, Oberon [played by Prince Henry], in a chariot, which to a loud triumphant music began to move forward, drawn by two white bears, and on either side guarded by three sylvans, with one going in front.[58]

The use of the pageant-car chariot indicates that while the perspective scene was being used, the emblematic devices of the older staging tradition were not being discarded.

Whichever form of changeable scenery was employed, the visual picture painted on the canvas flats was not only a realistic illusion in terms of perspective, but also a very bright illusion, because of the necessity for increased light. Clear tones and brilliant colour, much reflective gold and silver, and bright precious metals, were combined both on the scenery and the stage properties, in order to augment the general splendour.[59] The visual magnificence of Oberon's palace must have been great indeed, and in marked contrast to the darker opening scene. Both the palace and the rock mark the preference of the Renaissance for "that which displayed craggy cliffs and vast mountains," and "the temple," which was its scenic rival.[60] The scenery was, nevertheless, merely a background for action, perhaps because, as McDowell suggests, "Serlio's concept of scenery was pictorial rather than functional."[61]

The actors, dancers, and masquers appeared onstage in costumes which not only contributed to the general splendour of the scene, but also identified the character according to his rank or situation. Costumes were frequently obtained from the cast-off wardrobe items of the court, and made available through the Revels Office.[62] Elizabeth I left "behind her 'a rich wardrobe of more than two thousand gowns, with all things else answerable,' which in a very few months Anne of Denmark was cutting up to furnish a masque."[63] The costumes were often designed according to iconographic schemes, the recognition of which served to amuse the royal audience.[64] Unlike the dazzling and bejewelled masquers,

often representing classical divinities, the dancers of the antimasques, the "grotesques," were usually disguised as beasts or dressed in very ordinary clothes.[65] The possible nature of the costumes for the 1611 staging of The Tempest will be discussed in the following chapter.

The cost of the costumes, lighting, properties, and scenery for the masques was great. One argument against envisioning an elaborate, masque-like production of The Tempest is that, for the entire production, the King's Men received only little monetary reward and Shakespeare only a fraction of that. E.K. Chambers cites the payment of £60 in the Chambers Accounts for six performances between 31 October and 23 February, 1611-1612, to "John Heminges...for...the Kinges Ma^tes seruantes and players,"[66] which averages out to £10 per play. Mary Steele concludes that the amount paid to the King's Men for The Tempest was exactly £10.[67] However, the exact nature of this payment cannot be ascertained. Cunningham, quoting "The Accompte of the Money Expended by Sir David Murray K^t as Keaper of the Privie Purse," from 1 October 1610 to 6 November 1612, calculates that Oberon cost a total of £1,092, of which "Inigo Jones, devyser for the said Maske," received only £16.[68] Herford and Simpson, quoting the Pell Order Book, cite several instances of payments of over one hundred pounds to Jones, but all of these are said to be for "defraying the charges of the Princes Maske." However, "in rewarde" for "having been imployed amongest manie others for the p'paracon of the Pinces Maske," Inigo Jones and Ben Jonson received only £40 each.[69] This payment, while still substantially larger than that received by the King's Men for The Tempest, is very small in comparison to the total cost of the production. Jones was being paid here for his creativity. I suggest that the £10 received by Shakespeare's group

was a similar sort of payment, above and beyond the cost of scenery and costumes, which must have been absorbed by the Revels Office, relying on its stores. Certainly the royal court of King James I and Queen Anne would not have been satisfied with a production that cost only £10 to mount when thousands of pounds were being spent annually on elaborate masques.

The dancing place, stage, proscenium arch, lights, music, special effects, scenery, and costumes provided the lavish display of light, colour and sound destined to entertain the senses of a king. The "vision" disappeared immediately following the last performance of the masque, when the actors returned home, the courtiers retired to bed, the costumes and properties were returned to the Revels Office, and the Works Office dismantled the set. The pageant was "insubstantial" indeed, for after the striking of the scenery, it existed no more.[70] Prospero's famous lines, as we shall see, hold the key to Shakespeare's attitude towards the masque and new practices in image staging. Because of its date and place of production, The Tempest must be read anew in the light of these Italianate Jacobean conventions. Most of the evidence we have about its staging requirements lies in the text itself, to which we turn in the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE: A TEMPESTUOUS NOISE

John Smythson's extant drawing, Orazio Busino's description in 1618, and the reconstruction efforts of modern critics such as Ernest Law and Glynne Wickham, allow us to ascertain the physical nature of the theatre in which The Tempest was produced. The Whitehall Banqueting House, reconstructed specifically for masque productions, and the stage technology introduced there by Inigo Jones, define the theatrical environment in which the King's Men performed on the evening of 1 November 1611. However, the most encouraging evidence that The Tempest was presented under masque-like conditions is to be found in Shakespeare's text itself.

The 1623 Folio edition of Shakespeare's plays begins with The Tempest, and marks the first known printing of the play. The purity of the text of The Tempest, and the special nature of its stage

directions, have caused scholars such as Frank Kermode to consider that it was "set up not from a theatrical prompt-copy but from a transcript."[1] Kermode offers several critical opinions for such a judgment: that the first Folio play was to be a model for the editing of the others, that the first play was carefully produced so as to help sell the volume, and that the text was derived from one used for court production, as indicated by the masque-like stage directions. When these stage directions appear to demand Serlian techniques, in instances that will be demonstrated, this last opinion seems hard to deny.

Before examining the scenery potential of Shakespeare's play, however, it is necessary to point out that the costumes, as defined by his text, provide the first links between The Tempest on the evening of 1 November 1611 and a masque-like production of the play. The Revels Office supplied costumes for both plays and masques at court, and the King's Men had their own stores. The public Globe stage was often peopled by actors gloriously dressed as kings, queens, lords, and ladies. Common to all staging procedures employed in the Whitehall Banqueting House were elegant and splendid costumes. In order to acquire the most complete picture possible of the 1611 production of The Tempest, we must isolate all the textual evidence concerning costumes, properties, sound effects, and scenery that suggests how the play was staged before the King on that particular night.

The first actors to enter were the Ship-Master and Boatswain, who obviously came on from either side of the stage so as to meet each other. As the Master went off whence he came, several Mariners converged onstage to be ordered about by the Boatswain. Paul Reyher asserts, in Les Masques Anglais, that "le caractère du costume dépend

du rôle de celui qui le porte."[2] Bernice Freeman points out that "a great deal of care was devoted in all dramatic representations to accuracy in costume, so as to make it accord with the nationality as well as the rank, profession, or station of each character."[3] Thus we may safely assume the Mariners were nautically dressed. The Revels Accounts for 1573-1574 includes two references to money being allotted for "A Whissell of Sylv^{r} for a shipp M^{r} hiered" and "The hyer of a Marryners whissell,"[4] which suggest that one of the sailors in The Tempest could easily have been provided with a ship "master's whistle" to blow (I,i,7). The visual and aural representation of sailors on board a tempest-tossed ship was most certainly augmented in effect by the entrance of several Mariners "wet"(I,i,51). W.J. Lawrence notes that "this realistic touch is often to be found recurring in Elizabethan drama, and it would look as if at such junctures the unfortunate players, before making their appearance, were drenched with a bucket of water."[5]

To the general confusion and action of the Mariners entered the actors portraying "Alonso, Sebastian, Antonio, Ferdinand, Gonzalo, and others" of the royal party (I,i,9). Ariel says later in the play that the tempest left "not a blemish" on their garments (I,ii,218), and Gonzalo refers to these clothes in Act II as being put on "first in Afric, at the marriage of the King's fair daughter Claribel to the King of Tunis"(II,i,67-68). That the courtiers' costumes were splendid might be inferred from their wearers' rank; the fact that they were wedding day garments shows that they were very splendid indeed. The need for much silver and gold, dictated by the lighting inadequacies of the Banqueting House, must have been satisfied in part by the threads

in the costumes of the entourage of Alonso, King of Naples. Gonzalo refers to his "doublet" later in the play (II,i,98), but whether or not it was of Italian fashion we cannot know. However, since accuracy in costume was important, and since Jones has left us designs for Oriental, Polish, and British knights, for Barriers before 1613,[6] we may be reasonably certain that the courtiers were dressed not only according to their rank, but also their nationality. Antonio speaks of his dagger, made of "obedient steel, three inches of it"(II,i,278), and several courtiers carry swords. Thus we are informed of the necessary properties that must have completed the nobles' costumes.

Prospero was surely dressed, for the greater part of the evening's performance, as befitted a magician, in a "magic garment"(I, ii,24). The "garments"(I,ii,477), or "magic robes"(V,i,1), which identified his role to the Jacobean audience most succinctly, were removed only twice during the action of the play. Before telling her of their past, Prospero asks Miranda to "pluck" his "magic garment" from his back (I,ii,23-24). When Prospero calls to Ariel, as Miranda falls asleep, to "come," saying "I am ready now"(I,ii,187), he may refer directly to putting the magic robe back on again. In Act V, when the garment is to be removed forever, Prospero commands Ariel to

> Fetch me the hat and rapier in my cell:
> I will discase me, and myself present
> As I was sometime Milan.
> (V,i,84-86).

Ariel ostensibly brings only a hat and rapier, which would indicate that beneath his magic garment Prospero was always habited as the Duke

of Milan. In the Miranda story sequence of Act I, this fact would have reinforced his tale for the audience. The brief, seven-line song which Ariel sings in Act V, while helping Prospero don his hat and rapier, certainly does not allow for any greater change of dress. Prospero informs Miranda that at the moment of their exile, Gonzalo provided "Rich garments, linens, stuffs and necessaries,/ Which since have steaded much"(I,ii,164-165). Shakespeare here appears to have given the reason why Prospero is so richly furnished on the desolate island, in Italian fashion, as befitting the Duke of Milan.

Prospero's magic robes are not his only identifying mark as a magician. Ferdinand "is charmed from moving"(I,ii,469) by the power of "this stick"(I,ii,475), Prospero's demonstrable "magic wand," so to speak. It is referred to as his "staff" in Act V, when he states his intention to abandon magic (V,i,54), and is probably the instrument with which the magic circle in which to charm the courtiers is traced on the stage floor (V,i, 58). Prospero's magic will be discussed further in a later chapter; let it suffice for now to say that his magic robes, as Bernice Freeman suggests, "were probably made of rich materials highly embroidered in rich colours and queer designs, which in themselves held an air of mystery."[7]

Of Miranda's costume very little can be ascertained from the text. Narrative logic suggests that it derived from the same "rich garments" given to Prospero by Gonzalo. Doubtless it was Italian in design, in keeping with the practice of coordinating costume with rank and nationality. Ferdinand's reference to Miranda as a "goddess"(I,ii, 424) may indicate simply her physical beauty, or she may have been gloriously dressed. Indeed, since "glistering apparel" is later to

tempt Trinculo and Stephano (IV,i,193), there is no reason to suspect Miranda's finery of being any less attractive. Costumes worn in court masques for evening performances in the Whitehall Banqueting House were, as Nicoll points out, "to be viewed in the light of a thousand candles, the candlelight itself often determining the choice of this shade or of that, and always demanding a rich show of spangles to glitter in their reflected rays."[8] Since The Tempest in the Banqueting House was subject to the same exigencies of lighting, since Miranda is a Duke's daughter, and since Gonzalo saw fit to provide the exiles with suitable garments, Miranda, the "princess of the play," was surely a very pretty sight to behold.

Ariel's costumes, not including what he might have worn if he indeed "presented Ceres" in the betrothal masque (IV,i,167), are three in number. He appears as the airy or fiery spirit who "flam'd amazement" aboard the tempest tossed vessel (I,ii,198), and as the "nymph o' th' sea" who reigns invisible over much of the performance (I,ii,301), pausing for a moment, "like a Harpy," to terrorize Alonso and his courtiers (III,iii,53).

Ariel is physically unlike any other character in the Shakespearean canon, a far different sprite even from Oberon and Puck in A Midsummer's Night's Dream. When he first appears in the play, he tells Prospero how he frightened the men aboard ship:

> I flam'd amazement: sometime I'd divide,
> And burn in many places; on the topmast,
> The yards and boresprit, would I flame distinctly,
> Then meet and join.
>
> (I,ii,198-201).

The realm of fire was governed by Vulcan, and Ariel was dressed as befitted a follower of that incendiary god.[9] Vulcan himself had been represented onstage in Jonson's Lord Haddington's Masque (The Hue and Cry After Cupid) of 1608, "attired in a cassock girt to him, with bare arms, his hair and beard rough, his hat of blue and ending in a cone, in his hand a hammer and tongs, as coming from the forge."[10] A year and a half after The Tempest production, in 1613, for Campion's Lord's Masque, there appeared onstage in the Whitehall Banqueting House "Sixteen pages like fiery spirits, all their attires being alike composed of flames, with fiery wings and bases, bearing in either hand a torch of virgin wax."[11] If we except the tongs and torches, we can get a fair idea of Ariel's first costume from these contemporary descriptions. Ariel's avowed action aboard ship clearly identifies him as a "fiery spirit," and he must have appeared in a costume not unlike the pages in Campion's masque. Perhaps Shakespeare's Ariel even inspired the costumes for the "Stars" and "spirits" of the Lord's Masque.

Ariel spends most of the play attired, by Prospero's order, as a "sea" or "water" nymph. The magician commands:

> Go make thyself like a nymph o' th' sea:
> Be subject to
> No sight but thine and mine; invisible
> To every eyeball else. Go take this shape,
> And hither come in't: go: hence
> With diligence.
>
> (I,ii,301-306).

The Oceania light bearers of Jonson's Masque of Blackness of 1605 were designed by Inigo Jones to wear costumes of "sea-green, waved about

the skirts with gold and silver; their hair loose and flowing, garlanded with sea-grass, and that stuck with branches of coral."[12] A year before The Tempest production, river nymphs in Samuel Daniel's Tethys' Festival of 1610 were designed by Jones as follows:

> Now concerning their habit: first their head-tire was composed of shells and coral, and from a great murex shell in form of the crest of an helm hung a thin waving veil. Their upper garments had the bodies of sky-coloured taffetas for lightness, all embroidered with maritime invention; then they had a kind of half-skirts of cloth of silver embroidered with gold, all the ground-work cut out for lightness, which hung down full, and cut in points; underneath that came bases (of the same as was their bodies) beneath their knee. The long skirt was wrought with lace, waved round about like a river, and on the banks sedge and sea-weeds all of gold.[13]

Both the Oceaniae and the river nymphs wore coral in their hair, and had skirts of gold and silver "waved" round with a water pattern. Ariel's costume as a "water nymph"(I,ii,319) must have shared at least these elements, and was certainly one of the most visually splendid of the evening. Since, as Freeman notes, "there was available an enormous assortment of material in the charge of the Master of the Revels, called by him 'sundry garments of the store of the office,'" which "were at the disposal of Shakspere's company and were constantly being altered"[14] for each new performance, and since the costumes for Tethys' Festival would have been a part of the Revels "stores," Ariel may indeed have appeared onstage as a reworked Tethys' Festival river nymph.

Ariel's costume was completed by two hand properties, a tabor or "small drum, worn at the side,"[15] and a pipe. The stage directions explicity read "Ariel plays the tune on a tabor and pipe," for the

scene in which Trinculo and Stephano are persuaded by Caliban to destroy Prospero (III,ii,123). These two small instruments undoubtedly provided Ariel with his music throughout the performance.

As a water nymph Ariel is meant to appear "invisible" to all but Prospero (I,ii,376). The shipwrecked Ferdinand cannot see the source of music, though Shakespeare's text requires Ariel to be onstage with him. The bewildered prince wonders "Where should this music be? i' th' air or the 'arth?"(I,ii,390). The courtiers, lulled to sleep by "solemn music"(II,i,180), hear "nothing"(II,i,308). Trinculo bemoans "the tune of our catch, played by the picture of Nobody"(III,ii, 124-125), while Stephano earnestly wishes he "could see this taborer" (III,ii,148-149). Ariel's invisibility may or may not have been indicated by some sort of veil; however, Prospero's counsel to be "invisible/ To every eyeball" save his (I,ii,303-304), and the repeated complaint by the characters that the music comes from nowhere, was probably sufficient to denote Ariel's invisibility to Shakespeare's Jacobean audience.

In Act III, scene three, Ariel ceases to be a water nymph and appears onstage "like a Harpy," with "wings"(III,iii,53), to pronounce doom to Alonso's party, after which he "vanishes in thunder"(III,iii, 83). Bernice Freeman asserts that

> Harpies, as described by Vergil in the third book of the Aeneid, were fierce winged monsters with virgin faces and claws for hands. Their skin was supposed to be very thick so that it could not be cut by a sword. Ariel probably wore a tangled wig, enormous feather wings and tail, with claw shoes on his feet and claw-shaped gloves as well. His face and neck could have been masked to resemble the 'fated skin' that was 'proof to wounds.'[16]

Jonson's Fame, in the Masque of Queens, was dressed, the poet writes, "as Virgil describes her."[17] Shakespeare certainly knew Virgil's Aeneid, from which Ariel's costume could probably have been designed.

The "Names of the Actors" refer to Stephano as a "drunken butler" and Trinculo as "a jester." Alonso calls Stephano his "drunken butler" (V,i,277), and Prospero disparages Trinculo as a "dull fool"(V,i,297). Caliban calls Trinculo a "jesting monkey"(III,ii,44). The two actors playing these parts must have been appropriately dressed as the butler and fool of an Italian king. Caliban refers to Stephano's "knife"(III, ii,89), and throughout the "drunken butler" is, of course, armed with a bottle of spirits. In Act IV the three conspirators enter "all wet" (IV,i,194), having supposedly fallen in a dank "pool"(IV,i,208) which left them smelling "all horse-piss"(IV,i,199), all of which indicates that the actors were doused, like the Mariners earlier, with a bucket of water before making their entrance. Shakespeare's text thus not only tells us the dress and properties worn or carried by the actors, but also specifically helps us to envision the condition the costumes were in at a given moment.

The "jerkin" and "garments" which form the "glistering apparel" left to tempt Stephano and Trinculo by Prospero and Ariel, presumably from the original provisions of Gonzalo, were certainly as elegant and bright as any of the other costumes onstage. Indeed, they may have been made to glitter even more, for emphasis. John Cutts suggests that "the glistering apparel which they had stolen from Prospero and in which they had clothed their bestiality indicates the contrast between the lordly masquing attire which is put on to disguise their rude antimasquing nature underneath. The antimasque of spirits in the shape

of dogs and hounds which hunts them about is also...an indication of their bestiality."[18] Certainly the behaviour of the drunken butler and jester embodies the discord basic to the concept of the antimasque, though "bestiality" may be rather a strong description of it.

The dancers of the antimasque were usually costumed as either animals or very ordinary people.[19] The "divers Spirits," which Shakespeare's stage direction says chased Stephano, Trinculo, and Caliban off at the close of Act IV, were thus dressed exactly as designated, "in shape of dogs and hounds"(IV,i,255). If these animal-costumed actors represented "dogs and hounds" onstage, complete with appropriate barking, the same could easily have provided the animalistic sounds required during Ariel's songs of Act I, where the "Burthen dispersedly" cry "Bow-wow"(I,ii,384), noted by Ariel as "The watch dogs bark"(I,ii, 385).

The most important "beast" in the entire play is and was, of course, Caliban. G. Wilson Knight asserts that "all of Shakespeare's intuition of the untamed beast in man is here crystallized in the person of Caliban."[20] Prospero calls Caliban "A freckled whelp hag-born -- not honour'd with/ A human shape"(I,ii,283-284). Miranda can hardly bear to look upon the "savage," and considers him a "thing most brutish"(I,ii,357-359). Trinculo, coming upon Caliban lying flat, cannot decide if he be "a man or a fish," opts for calling him a "monster...Legg'd like a man! and his fins like arms," concludes that he is "an islander, that hath lately suffered by a thunderbolt," and finally seeks shelter from the oncoming storm under Caliban's "gaberdine"(II,ii,25-40). At this point Shakespeare's text provides not only some indication as to how the actor playing Caliban was costumed, but

clearly allows us to envision the onstage action as it must have occurred. Stephano and Trinculo repeatedly call Caliban a "moon-calf."[21] At one point Trinculo refers to him as a "puppy-headed monster"(II,ii, 154-155), but later returns to his first analysis that Caliban is "but half a fish and half a monster"(III,ii,28). Antonio obviously is speaking of Caliban when he says of the three would-be conspirators that "one of them/ Is a plain fish"(V,i,265-266). Finally, Prospero calls Caliban a "mis-shapen knave"(V,i,268), who "is as disproportion'd in his manners/ As in his shape"(V,i,290-291). From this motley group of descriptions, we know that Caliban in the Whitehall Banqueting House must have been a fantastic sight. He had human legs and fin-like arms, wore a cloak of gaberdine, looked generally monstrous, and, since he himself refers to his "barefoot way"(II,ii,11) he wore no shoes.

Several critics attempt to associate the description of Caliban with strange tales brought to England, during Shakespeare's time, from various parts of the "New World."[22] However, wild-man figures, grotesques, and animal-costumed actors abounded in masques, marking, in essence, as Allardyce Nicoll points out, "the spirit of the 'anti-masque,' by comparison with which the main masque and its gorgeously dignified figures become richer and more splendid."[23] Caliban's monstrous appearance and his efforts to conspire against Prospero embody the discord characteristic of the behaviour of antimasquers in general. This discordant character must have improved the Jacobean audience's opinion of Prospero, with his efforts at reconciliation, love, and peace. The important factor is not how, precisely, Caliban was dressed, but that his presence in The Tempest suggests that the very structure of Shakespeare's play was influenced by the Whitehall

masque traditions and conventions.

As an aural accompaniment to all the costumes and properties on display, Shakespeare's text prescribes various sound effects, such as recurring rolls of thunder and Ariel's songs. When juxtaposed to the animal cries of "Bow-wow" and "Cock a diddle dow"(I,ii,386,390), Ariel's songs in the first act emphasize the confusion of Ferdinand. The "noise of hunters heard"(IV,i,255), specified by the stage direction, might have been effected by hunter's horns and sundry cries, and certainly contributes to the supposed fright and confusion of Stephano, Trinculo, and Caliban as they are chased offstage by the hounds. Frances Shirley asserts that thunder usually had "magical implications,"[24] and J.R. Brown suggests that "by repeating the sound-effect of thunder, Shakespeare keeps the sea storm echoing throughout the play and makes it serve as a continuing reminder of Prospero's supernatural powers."[25] The last sulphurous roll, as the Harpy "vanishes in thunder," gives way to "soft music"(III,iii,83), which for the remainder of the play marks the return of civilized order and universal harmony. The transition from discordant thunder to music suggests, again, that a masque-like atmosphere was created for The Tempest on the evening of 1 November 1611.

For the Jacobean masques, as a visual backdrop to the costumes, properties, and sound, Jones always provided the Whitehall Banqueting House stage with a perspective scene. Further examination of Shakespeare's text suggests that The Tempest was similarly provided. Before beginning such study, however, it is necessary to clarify the relationship between stage directions, lines describing images, and actual scenic devices. Stage directions in The Tempest provide explicit

and indubitable evidence that certain stage technology was deployed. Lines, or the words of characters, only occasionally do so, but, as Stephen Orgel points out in Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, "there was for Jonson a basic connection between the image and the word," and "for the Renaissance artist, the relation between verbal statements and visual representations was direct and unquestioned."[26] Shakespeare, Jonson's colleague and an artist of the English Renaissance, uses several demonstrative references to images in The Tempest, "picture words" which could easily have been depicted by scenery.

The question again arises as to whether the stage directions were meant to apply to a setting composed of dispersed emblems or of one unified scenic backdrop. The remarkable adherence of The Tempest to the neo-Aristotelian unities of time and place suggests that Shakespeare was at least philosophically concerned with presenting a unified image. A.M. Nagler, speaking of the court, asks:

> Would an audience that had just seen the illusionistic stage of succession with its perspective paintings used in a masque have been content to see a play by Shakespeare...on the old polyscenic stage of juxtaposition? We have no proof that Jones had anything to do with the Court productions of plays belonging to the repertory of the public theatres. But we do know that the same office supervised the performance both of masques and of plays and that the same artisans prepared the stage for both. Should we not, therefore, assume that some of the artistic principles governing the production of the masques affected the staging of the plays.[27]

Such an assumption, when combined with an examination of the text of the play, permits a clear and significant interpretation of certain stage directions and lines. In 1922, Ernest Law suggested that a perspective scene may have formed a backdrop to emblematic devices for

the first production of The Tempest. Attempting a reconstruction of the 1611 performance, in Shakespeare's Tempest as Originally Produced at Court, Law asserted that not far from Prospero's "inner stage" cell "must have been the rock from which Caliban comes forth, and which was evidently a visible, tangible thing; for it is referred to distinctly by Prospero....On another side may have been represented 'the lime-grove that weather fended his cell' -- by practical trees. And the efforts of the Revels men may not have ended there; for they perhaps even showed a distant landscape and 'the rocky marge' and 'yellow sands' of 'the never surfeiting sea.'"[28] Shakespeare's text suggests that the Revels men may indeed have furnished The Tempest with a landscape scene on the evening of 1 November 1611.

Act I, scene one opens with a very explicit stage direction: "a tempestuous noise of thunder and lightning heard."[29] Inigo Jones had effected lightning in only one masque before 1611, in Samuel Daniel's Tethys' Festival of 1610.[30] Serlio's definitive instructions for producing thunder and lightning were made available by the 1611 translation of his architectural treatise. It would appear that the use of these storm effects to begin a performance in the Whitehall Banqueting House was innovative on Shakespeare's part. If a front curtain was present, the opening sound effects would have covered any noise involved in its dropping or drawing, and removal. Certainly the exploding sulphur and rolling lead ball of the Serlian thunder and lightning devices would have provided a more than adequate aural representation of the tempest, and "a Squib couered ouer with pure gold or shining sattin"[31] would have served to create the visual effect of lightning. Serlio's machine, designed for indoor Italian playhouses,

was especially suitable for the Whitehall Banqueting House, where the firing of cannon, as in the public theatres, was impractical. Perhaps Shakespeare intended to demonstrate his knowledge of Serlian technology with such a spectacular opening moment to his play.

The onstage confusion, the language of the Boatswain, and the despair of both sailors and courtiers could well have identified The Tempest's opening moments as taking place on board a ship, represented by a bare stage set with a few nautical emblems. However, the most suggestive evidence for scenery change in The Tempest occurs at the close of this first scene. In 1608, in Jonson's Lord Haddington's Masque, a perspective scene of "a high, steep, red cliff advancing itself into the clouds"[32] was painted, as William Armstrong explains, "on two large canvas flats or shutters; when a change of scene was required, one of these flats was quickly drawn to one side of the stage, the other to the other side, so as to reveal another painted scene behind them."[33] In Lord Haddington's Masque, the character Vulcan cried "Cleave, solid rock, and bring the wonder forth," at which point, "with a loud and full music, the cliff parted in the midst and discovered an illustrious concave filled with ample and glistering light."[34] This 'scena ductilis' method of scene change was also used by Jones in the 1611 production of Oberon. The use of loud music to cover the sound of the drawing of two flats was common practice. In James Shirley's The Triumph of Peace, staged by Inigo Jones in 1634, the stage direction reads: "there is heard a great noise and confusion of voices within...then a crack is heard in the works, as if there were some danger by some piece of the machines falling."[35] Allardyce Nicoll asserts that the "great noise and confusion" was meant to

distract the audience while the scene changed.[36] The first scene of The Tempest concludes with a similar confusion of voices:

> A confused noise within: "Mercy on us!" -- "We split, we split!" -- "Farewell, my wife and children!" --
> "Farewell, brother!" -- "We split, we split, we split!" (I,i,58-61).

It may have been the case that, amid the "confused noise within" and the many cries of "we split," the opening scene of The Tempest "split" or divided, revealing another perspective behind. The similarity between Jonson's use of the word "Cleave" and Shakespeare's use of "split" is striking. Even more attractive is the similarity between Shakespeare's "a confused noise within," and Shirley's "great noise and confusion;" however, The Triumph of Peace seems rather late in time to support the argument for a scene change in The Tempest.

An opening scene would have had to represent at least a storm at sea. Scenery illustrated or symbolized locations more often than it provided a realistic depiction of a specific place. Perhaps The Tempest at court began with a perspective of a ship in the middle of a tempest of sea and clouds,[37] a symbolic representation of the situation onstage. That such an opening scene would have had to be dark and overcast is obvious from the need to represent a storm. However, there was emerging in the Jacobean masques a tradition whereby an initial gloomy scene gave way to brighter things. In Campion's Lord Hay's Masque of 1607, a "double veil, so artificially painted that it seemed as if dark clouds had hung" before the stage "concealed a green valley with green trees round about it, and in the midst of them nine golden trees of

fifteen foot high, with arms and branches very glorious to behold."[38] In Jonson's Masque of Beauty of 1608, a curtain "in which the night was painted" opened to reveal "an island floating on a calm water."[39] In Jonson's Haddington Masque of 1608, as has been mentioned, a cliff opened to reveal a bright "concave" by means of the 'scena ductilis.' In Daniel's Tethys' Festival of 1610, a curtain on which "was figured a dark cloud intersert with certain sparkling stars" was drawn to reveal "a port or haven, with bulwarks at the entrance and the figure of a castle commanding a fortified town; within this port were many ships... some nearer and some further off according to perspective."[40] Finally, in the 1611 production of Jonson's Oberon, the dark rock "all obscure" gave way to "the frontispiece of a bright and glorious palace."[41] Both curtains and flats, then, were used to discover the main or first scene, and frequently darkness gave way to bright light.

The near iconographic nature of this practice seems particularly suited to the theme of enlightenment found in The Tempest. In the production of 1611 a dark curtain or a pair of flats may have been painted to represent a storm. The choice, by Shakespeare, of the word "split" seems to indicate the employment of the 'scena ductilis.' This storm scene would have divided to reveal Prospero's island, as the confusion of the Mariners was replaced by the calm voices of the magician and Miranda. Gonzalo's remark as he exits, that he would "give a thousand furlongs of sea for an acre of barren ground, long heath, broom, furze, anything"(I,i,64-66), suddenly emerges as a very ironic line, for such quiet though desolate ground was probably the nature of the scene being discovered. Above the "Names of the Actors" and the play's text itself, occurs the headline, "The Scene, an

uninhabited Island." This indeed may have been the discovered "scene," which examination will reveal to be one that satisfies all requirements to the end of the play. Thus it may be said that the 1611 production of The Tempest may very well have involved only one change of scene, from a tempest-tossed ship to a deserted island, accomplished via the splitting of the first scene according to the Serlian 'scena ductilis' technique.

Frank Kermode, in the Arden edition of The Tempest, includes a set of identifying place directions for each scene, attempting thereby to distinguish between the area before Prospero's cell and various other parts of the island. The text reveals that such distinction is at best misleading. There is no reason why the entire action of the play could not have taken place in front of one unifying backdrop. In Act I, scene two, Prospero, Miranda, Ariel, Caliban, and Ferdinand come together in one place at various times. The Alonso party inherit the same area in Act II, scene one, and are replaced by Caliban, returning to where he had been ordered to collect wood. Caliban is then joined by Trinculo and Stephano. As they go off, Ferdinand returns, in Act III, scene one, with the log he was ordered to carry, and is met by Miranda and observed by Prospero. Caliban, Trinculo, and Stephano return in scene two, the courtiers in scene three. Gonzalo's words, that "here's a maze trod, indeed,/ Through forth-rights and meanders" (III,iii,2-3), indicate, perhaps, that the courtiers have become so lost that they are travelling in circles. This would not only explain their return to the same place, but would also be in keeping with the labyrinth motif and the thematic confusion which characterizes the efforts of all the shipwrecked men. Until enlightened by Prospero,

while standing in the magic "circle which Prospero had made" on the stage floor (V,i,58), the courtiers remain lost. The suggestion that their path was meant to appear circular is perhaps reinforced by this magic circle, a symbol of the trap in which they are caught. The only substantial deviation from this one basic scene occurs during the betrothal masque, which will be discussed later. Thus, only one scene change, from tempest to island, is required by Shakespeare's text, a fact which increases the possibility that the 'scena ductilis' technique was indeed used. Such a simple, single change of scenery was common in the Whitehall Banqueting House masque productions. Furthermore, it seems highly unlikely that The Tempest would have been staged in front of the open northern wall of the Banqueting House. A curtain, or a set of flats, was needed to provide a tiring room area under the gallery, as Glynne Wickham suggests,[42] and this covering would not have been left bare in a theatre where perspective landscapes were regularly seen.

Indeed, the backdrop scene for the 1611 production of The Tempest would have had to be painted as a landscape, representing the desolate "uninhabited island" specified by the textual headline and described by various characters throughout the play. Whether or not the demonstrative "this" reinforces the argument for perspective scenery, when referring to "this island"(I,ii,281, and others), cannot be ascertained, since it was often the custom to refer thus to places not depicted on the Globe public stage. However, in Jonson's Oberon, Silenus refers to "these" nights when the scene represents night,[43] to "Yonder" palace when the scene represents Oberon's palace,[44] and to "yond' high throne" and "this seat" as Oberon approaches in a

chariot, sitting on a throne.[45] Similar direct references by demonstratives to action specified in the stage directions in other masques suggest that there was often a close link between verbal statement and visual representation. For this reason, we must lend some credence to the demonstrative power of certain words used by characters in The Tempest to describe the scene.

Ariel's first song, as he leads Ferdinand to Prospero, includes the line, "Come unto these yellow sands"(I,ii,377). Trinculo laments "there is no other shelter hereabout" as he hides under Caliban's "gaberdine" from the oncoming storm (II,ii,39-40). The apparent lack of shelter suggests at least that no practical trees were present onstage at that moment. In Act III, scene three Ariel calls the isle "most desolate"(80), an epithet which shows that there could not have been a lush or luxurious landscape scene. Prospero also speaks of "sands"(V,i,34), and in the Epilogue refers to "this bare island"(8). Certainly two possibilities emerge. The first is that the stage was indeed bare. The second is that painted in perspective was a "most desolate" and "uninhabited" island, Gonzalo's "acre of barren ground" (I,i,65).

In Act I, scene two, Prospero and Miranda move across or upstage to "visit Caliban," who answers from "within"(310,316), but who later refers to "this hard rock"(345) and "this rock"(363) in which he lives. These demonstrative references to Caliban's rock suggest that an emblematic structure was placed on the stage. From its concave upstage side, Caliban might have emerged. Such a rock, a common emblem of the Elizabethan public theatres and pageants,[46] certainly would have contributed to the overall bleakness of the island. It may have

been used later by Gonzalo, who is tired and advised by Alonso to "sit down, and rest"(III,iii,6). Certainly there was no other provision for seating, other than the stage floor. The emblematic rock could have been augmented in effect by several painted in perspective on the flat behind.

The desolate island of The Tempest does have some green growth on it, in effect the "heath, broom, furze" of Gonzalo's wish as he abandons ship. Gonzalo remarks just after having arrived on the scene in Act II, "How lush and lusty the grass looks! how green!," to which Antonio replies, "The ground, indeed, is tawny," only to be corrected by Sebastian, who notes "an eye of green in't"(II,i,51-53). Ceres speaks of "this short-grass'd green" and Iris calls the nymphs to dance on "this green land" during Prospero's masque (IV,i,83,130). The dancing place of the Whitehall Banqueting House was usually carpeted in green. Busino referred to "a fine and spacious area all covered with green cloth" in the middle of the room, in his description of 1618.[47] Ernest Law asserted that "the usual practice in masques in the royal theatres" was to cover the stage floor with "some sort of green cloth or baize for the dancing."[48] The quantity of dancing required by Shakespeare's text, and the common presence of such a floor covering in the Whitehall Banqueting House, not only allows us to assume a green carpet for The Tempest production, but also lends force to the demonstrative "this" used in reference to the "grass." The grass may also have extended into the painted scene.

Shakespeare's text also demands the presence of a small grove of trees. Ariel refers to "the line-grove which weather-fends" Prospero's cell (V,i,10). Earlier Ariel supposedly hung the

"glistering apparel" meant to seduce Trinculo and Stephano "on this line"(IV,i,193), and the two clowns speak of stealing the clothes from the "lime" or linden-trees."[49] There is no reason to see the trees before Act IV, indeed, the lack of shelter referred to would seem to deny their existence onstage. A few trees were very likely moved into place for Act IV, not unlike the "green trees" which were provided for Lord Hay's Masque[50] in 1607. The division of this Shakespearean play into acts and scenes, unlike earlier plays, suggests again that scenery change is being indicated, as in this instance. Trees were, like rocks, common emblematic devices on the Elizabethan and Jacobean stage.[51] There may have been supplementary trees painted on the backdrop.

Another structure that must have been placed onstage was Prospero's cell. In Act IV, Prospero tells Ferdinand and Miranda to "retire into my cell"(IV,i,161), where they remain until their discovery in Act V, when Prospero commands Alonso and his entourage to "look in" and see the lovers. Prospero here refers to his home, saying "This cell's my court"(V,i,166-167). At the conclusion of the play he invites the courtiers and lovers to his "poor cell" to take their "rest/ For this one night"(V,i,300-302), before returning to Milan. Prospero's "cell" at this point ceases to be a discovery space for two actors, becoming rather the exit for at least nine persons (Prospero, Miranda, Ferdinand, Alonso, Gonzalo, Sebastian, Antonio, Adrian, and Francisco). This suggests that the structure must have been placed to one side of the stage, so that those entering it were actually going offstage. There must have been at least a partial interior for the Miranda-Ferdinand discovery. Prospero's "cell" was probably an emblematic canvas mansion, such as those used extensively

on the Elizabethan public stage,[52] not unlike those Hotson suggests were used for Twelfth Night. It could have been moved into place with the trees before Act IV, since its presence onstage is not required before then.

Since the "grass" was the carpeted dancing place, and the "rock," "line-grove," and "cell" were emblematic structures, no perspective backdrop was crucial or essential to a production of The Tempest. Indeed, if the play was to be practical for the public stage such a requirement would have been unrealistic. However, the use of emblematic devices to augment the general effect provided by a perspective scene was typical of masques produced in the Whitehall Banqueting House before 1611. Thrones, trees, altars, chariots, and so on had often appeared along with lavishly painted backdrops.[53] The presence of the rock, trees, and cell in The Tempest certainly does not rule out a perspective scene for its Whitehall production. The masques were always "backed" by painted flats or a large, canvas, mural curtain. The Masque of Blackness, The Entertainment at Theobalds, Tethys' Festival, and Oberon all specifically included a landscape scene. The emblematic devices used for The Tempest aid us in ascertaining what sort of landscape scene might have been painted to represent Prospero's "desolate isle." It need not have been a perspective extension of the emblematic devices; rather it might simply have represented an island surrounded by sea, a merely symbolic illustration. Attempts at total realism in scenery had not yet been made. Whatever the "picture," it seems a distinct probability that the emblematic devices were backed by a perspective scene which reinforced the image of a barren and uninhabited island for the Whitehall

Banqueting House production of The Tempest.

Less speculatively, we may safely assume that above the entire proceedings, suspended by ropes and pulleys from the roof, in front of the perspective scene's sky and above the emblems, hung a large cloud. Gonzalo and Antonio, punning on Alonso's disposition, refer to "foul weather"(II,i,137-138), and their irony would have been sharper had such a cloud actually hung above them. Trinculo, amid repeated thunder, specifically refers to "yond same black cloud, yond huge one," which "looks like a foul bombard that would shed his liquor"(II,ii,20-22). Caliban dreams of "clouds" that open to drop riches (III,ii,139), perhaps an oblique but purposeful reference by Shakespeare to the forthcoming action of the "cloud" during the masque of Juno, Iris, and Ceres. Cloud machines were common on the public stage, in the private theatres, and in pageants. Trinculo's use of the demonstrative "yond," so like Silenus's "yond" in Oberon when referring to Oberon's throne, strongly suggests the presence of the cloud in the Whitehall Banqueting House on the evening of 1 November 1611.

Aside from the banquet-table scene, the betrothal masque, and the discovery at chess, no deviation from the island scene is required by Shakespeare's text. Indeed, the neo-Aristotelian unity of the play would have been reinforced in the minds of the Jacobean audience by the use of one backdrop.

The costumes, sound effects, and scenery that have been suggested as part of the production of The Tempest on 1 November 1611 acquire a significance and a purpose heretofore unrealized when the scenic requirements of the banquet-table scene, the betrothal masque, and the discovery at chess are examined. These three special moments

in the play's theatrical art, to be studied in the next chapter, underline the need to understand why The Tempest must have been given a masque-like production in the Whitehall Banqueting House.

CHAPTER FOUR: A MOST MAJESTIC VISION

The Tempest was performed in the Whitehall Banqueting House, the court theatre which had been reconstructed by James I and adapted by Inigo Jones to house productions of masques, with their measured dances, gorgeously dressed figures, and spectacular perspective scenes. Frequently, as brightness replaced a night or cloud scene, grotesquely costumed antimasquers made way for the elegant ladies and gentlemen who embodied the order and harmony of the masque proper.

In Jonson's Masque of Beauty of 1608, the evil wind Boreas, "his hair and beard rough and horrid, his wings grey and full of snow and icicles...his feet ending in serpents' tails," was succeeded by Vulturnus, a "somewhat sweeter" deity who claimed himself to be "a gentler wind," just before the night scene was drawn.[1] In Jonson's Masque of Queens of 1609, eleven witches, "some with rats on their

head...all with spindles, timbrels, rattles or other venefical instruments, making a confused noise, with strange gestures," vanished into a scene representing "an ugly hell" as it was replaced by a "glorious and magnificent building figuring the House of Fame."[2] In Oberon, the "antic action and gestures"[3] of the satyrs gave way to the orderly dances of the masquers. In remarkably similar fashion, in Shakespeare's The Tempest, the "mocks and mows" of the strange shapes accompanying Ariel as Harpy (III,iii), are replaced by the "graceful dance" and spectacle of the betrothal masque (IV,i,). Shakespeare, however, went one step further, for yet another vision is revealed: Miranda and Ferdinand "playing at chess"(V,i,172). An examination of these three vital moments in the play discloses, I suggest, Shakespeare's apprehension of the masque as a form of theatrical entertainment.

The banquet-table scene is like an antimasque, with its grotesque shapes and strange movement. The antimasque represented disorder in the Jonsonian masque and, as Stephen Orgel points out, "grotesquerie and disorder are characteristics of 'misrule.'"[4] The combination of "strange Shapes," Ariel dressed "like a Harpy," and grotesque dancing with the misrule embodied in Antonio and Sebastian must have caused the Jacobean audience not only to recognize the essential elements of antimasque, but also to understand the principle of good underlying all of Prospero's magic.

The banquet-table scene begins, as the stage direction prescribes, with "solemn and strange music," amid which enter "several strange Shapes, bringing in a banquet," who dance "about it with gentle actions of salutations...inviting the King, &c., to eat"(III,iii,18). Gonzalo remarks that the "strange Shapes" are "monstrous"(III,iii,31).

Evidently the actors carrying on the banquet were dressed in weird and grotesque costumes.

Stephen Orgel observes that antimasque dance movement was usually performed by professionals and "was most often grotesque or acrobatic in nature."[5] Jonson, in the Masque of Queens, describes the dance of his witches thus: "with a strange and sudden music they fell into a magical dance full of preposterous change and gesticulation, but most applying to their property, who at their meetings do all things contrary to the custom of men, dancing back to back and hip to hip, their hands joined, and making their circles backward, to the left hand, with strange fantastic motions of their heads and bodies."[6] Shakespeare's text for The Tempest calls for the Shapes to dance "with gentle actions of salutations" when bringing the banquet onstage, but has them go off dancing "with mocks and mows" with the empty table towards the end of the scene (III,iii,83). Clearly Shakespeare intended the "salutations" to be deceptive, so as to entice Alonso's party to eat. The "mocks and mows" were probably grotesque and acrobatic, not unlike the gestures of Jonson's witches in the Masque of Queens and of the satyrs in Oberon, and meant to reveal the true nature of both banquet and Shapes to the Jacobean court audience.

At the moment when Alonso invites his courtiers to partake of the banquet, it is made to disappear. The stage direction reads: "Thunder and lightning. Enter Ariel like a Harpy; claps his wings upon the table; and with a quaint device, the banquet vanishes"(III, iii,53). The available Serlian method for effecting thunder and lightning, and the possible nature of Ariel's costume have been discussed; the vanishing banquet has not. John Adams conjectures that

"the table was covered with a thick fringed cloth, large enough to reach on all four sides almost to the stage floor,"[7] and, using a Restoration example, he speculates that a man under the table, concealed by the cloth, at an appropriate signal opened a trap which allowed the food to disappear into a receptacle, and which closed again to reveal a bare table top. Adams reconstructs the scene such that "Ariel, flying in a prone or inclined position, reached down with his wings, clapped them on the table [the signal], and remained in that position for the second or two required for clearing away the banquet."[8] Ivor Brown, asserting that "the use of the winch for air-borne actors was easier to work from the ceiling," also supposes that Ariel flew in and that "the quaint device must have been a trapdoor effect."[9] Martin Holmes agrees at least about the nature of the table, maintaining that "Henslowe had one, as may be seen from the Dulwich property-lists, for a play about a mythical personage called Bellenden or Belin Dun, whose wonder-working table could spread itself and serve up a banquet at will."[10] Certainly the exact nature of the "quaint device" will never be known, but a trapdoor effect seems most probable.

Less convincing is the argument that Ariel flew in. Dressed "like a Harpy," he could simply have entered on foot. There is no textual indication that he descended or ascended, though there is later for Juno in the betrothal masque (IV,i,73). After his gloomy pronouncement that "Ling'ring perdition...shall step by step attend" the courtiers (III,iii,77-78), Ariel simply "vanishes in thunder," after which the Shapes, "with mocks and mows" are said to carry out the table (III,iii,83). The effect of Ariel's exit is one of sound, not of light; the roll of thunder probably reinforced Prospero's power and

the curse itself in the minds of the Jacobean audience.

The vision of the banquet and Ariel's pronouncement cause Alonso to remember the "name of Prosper"(III,iii,99), whom he helped Antonio to usurp. Sebastian speaks of fighting "one fiend at a time"(III,iii, 102-103), indicating his apprehension of the Shapes as demons. The banquet-table scene must have served to remind Shakespeare's audience of the evil disorder and misrule Prospero spoke of in the first act. The consequence of such evil is, to use Gonzalo's words, "great guilt" (III,iii,104), and to use Shakespeare's image, a bare table. Clearly Shakespeare's "Shapes," "mocks and mows," and denunciation of evil evoke the elements and philosophy of the antimasque, introduced into the masque entertainment by his friend, Ben Jonson.

The audience's focus on the banquet-table was disrupted three times by the presence of "Prospero on the top (invisible)"(III,iii,18), at the three occasions when, separated from the scene, he comments on the action below him. The magician's reference to the work of his "meaner ministers," and his own "high charms"(III,iii,87-88), made just before he leaves the scene, very possibly was emphasized, if not dictated, by the nature of the Whitehall Banqueting House stage environment. Glynne Wickham's "ground-plan and elevation of the northern (or stage) end of the first Jacobean Banquet House,"[11] based on the Smythson drawing, indicates that behind the stage area, separated from it by four columns, was a gallery, which Wickham suggests became a tiring room when concealed by canvas or flats. Wickham states, however, that unlike the high ceilinged hall, the gallery had a low ceiling, for above it was a second, upper gallery. If Prospero appeared "on the top," he must have been positioned in this upper

gallery, from which he could observe the scene below. The stage direction shows the need for an elevated area of some sort, and this upper gallery seems to have been the only space available in the Whitehall Banqueting House. Certainly a similar elevated area was provided both at the Blackfriars and the Globe, and the frequency of its use in Elizabethan and Jacobean drama suggests that the Banqueting House would have been deficient without such a space. The height of the upper gallery would have reinforced the impression of Prospero's great power over, and manipulation of, the Alonso party.

The banquet-table scene, embodying the disorder and misrule of the antimasque, is quickly followed in The Tempest text (approximately eighty lines later) by the betrothal masque for Ferdinand and Miranda, as the grotesque is replaced by the beautiful and the spirit of evil gives way to the principle of good. As Prospero commands the lovers to be "all eyes! be silent," "soft music" begins the masque (IV,i,60). As has been established, music and spectacle were the essence and motivating principle of Tudor and Jacobean masques, along with dance, and Prospero's entertainment must have been no exception. The text of The Tempest at this point in the play is replete with demands for music, to underscore the action, to accompany the songs of Juno and Ceres, and to animate the dancing of the Nymphs and Reapers. Simultaneously it commands a vision to satisfy the sense of sight, through the presence of actors gorgeously costumed to represent classical goddesses. Shakespeare's inclusion of Prospero's "revels" (IV,i,148) clearly indicates his awareness of masque conventions. That his play was produced in the Whitehall Banqueting House, for (one trusts) an admiring audience, suggests that Prospero's masque

was not a masque in name only, but a spectacular and "majestic vision" (IV,i,118) designed to meet the expectations of noble Jacobeans accustomed to visual splendor in this highly developed and specialized form of entertainment.

The first part of the masque involves the three Olympian goddesses, Juno, Iris, and Ceres. The stated purpose of the three is not merely "To come and sport" or "to entertain"(IV,i,74-75), but more important, "A contract of true love to celebrate;/ And some donation freely to estate/ On the blest lovers"(IV,i,83-86). Their very physical appearance contributes to what Ferdinand admiringly calls "a most majestic vision"(IV,i,118). Indeed, their costumes on the evening of 1 November 1611 must have been spectacular.

Iris was first on the scene, and her costume is partially described by Ceres in Shakespeare's text. Ceres speaks of the "many-colour'd messenger"(IV,i,76) as having "saffron wings"(IV,i,78) and a "blue bow" which forms a "Rich scarf" to the "earth"(IV,i,80-82). Iris had been associated with the rainbow both in Samuel Daniel's Vision of the Twelve Goddesses of 1604,[12] and Jonson's Hymenai of 1616.[13] Iris was represented onstage in Francis Beaumont's Masque of the Inner Temple of 1613, dressed "in variable colours, like the rainbow, a cloudy wreath on her head."[14] Allardyce Nicoll asserts that "part of the audience's delight in watching the scenes unfold undoubtedly arose from an immediate recognition of certain figures presented in painted form on the 'ornaments' [of the proscenium arch] or incorporated materially in the masquers' costumes," and that those who had "read Cesare Ripa's Iconologia, were able to identify the figure for their neighbours."[15] Iris's costume for The Tempest must

have been iconographically correct, her dress being "many-colour'd," as Ceres says, with orange-yellow wings and a blue scarf.

Ceres herself must also have been attired according to the iconographic expectations of the audience. Her dress is not described by Shakespeare's text, but she had appeared in Daniel's Vision of the Twelve Goddesses of 1604, "in straw colour and silver embroidery with ears of corn and a [head] dressing of the same," carrying "a sickle."[16] Ceres must have been similarly dressed in 1611, so as to be recognized by the audience.

Juno appeared in Daniel's masque "in a sky-colour mantle embroidered with gold and figured with peacocks' feathers, wearing a crown of gold on her head," and carrying "a sceptre."[17] In Jonson's Hymenai of 1606, Juno was represented "sitting in a throne supported by two beautiful peacocks; her attire rich and like a queen, a white diadem on her head from whence descended a veil, and that bound a fascia of several-coloured silks, set with all sorts of jewels and raised in the top with lilies and roses; in her right hand she held a sceptre, in the other a timbrel; at her golden feet the hide of a lion was placed."[18] Shakespeare's Juno may have been similarly costumed. Perhaps the Revels' stores provided the already designed and executed costumes from Jonson's masque for the production of The Tempest. Since a costume less fine or less iconographic would have been inconsistent with court practice in the Whitehall Banqueting House, we must at least recognize the costumes of earlier masques as prototypes for the costumes of The Tempest.

Iris summons Ceres to meet with Juno on "this grass-plot," presumably the dancing place carpeted with green cloth. Iris's comment

that, as Juno descends, her "peacocks fly amain"(IV,i,74), not only allows the traditional peacock association to be recognized, but also recalls Jonson's Hymenai where "the upper part of the scene, which was all of clouds and made artificially to swell and ride like the rack, began to open, and, the air clearing, in the top thereof was discovered Juno sitting in a throne supported by two beautiful peacocks."[19] Juno, revealed when the clouds parted, was most likely enthroned above the action of masque in the upper gallery of the Banqueting House. In Hymenai, eight of Juno's "noblest powers descend,/ Which are enstyled her faculties/ That govern nuptial mysteries."[20] Jonson describes their descent as having been made "in two great clouds that put forth themselves severally and, with one measure of time, were seen to stoop and fall gently down upon the earth," during which time a "song was sung at the altar."[21] After several appropriate dances, Jonson's text asserts that "the whole scene" was "drawn again, and all covered with clouds, as a night."[22] Allardyce Nicoll postulates that

> here Jones was applying certain principles which had been established in Italy and which were to be set down in description by Sabbatini [in 1638]...To procure the desired result...a strong beam, 25 feet long, was constructed to serve as a lever, the fulcrum being out of the spectators' range of vision. On the front end was placed the platform containing the character who had to descend, the beam being concealed by a frame painted to resemble clouds; at the other end a rope, carried to a pulley in the roof, thence to a pulley on the stage floor immediately below, and from there to a capstan, controlled the raising and lowering of the machine.[23]

Nicoll suggests various alternative but essentially similar methods of engineering the cloud machine; however, the result was always the same:

a cloud tilted forward and descended, revealing a character who was thus put to the floor. Such machinery would have had to be erected in the upper gallery of the Banqueting House, the fulcrum being placed at the outer edge overlooking the stage. In Hymenai the clouds first "began to open," then "put forth themselves severally," after which they "were seen to stoop and fall gently down upon the earth," namely the stage floor. This description suggests that there were two beams, each with a cloud-disguised platform on the front end. First the two beams were pushed apart, "the air clearing," then they were slid over the edge of the gallery and tilted, allowing the front end with the eight "noblest powers" to descend to stage level. The upper gallery, 16 feet deep, could easily have accommodated such beams, which would have hung over the stage 9 feet until pushed forward and tilted.

In The Tempest, five years following Jones's production of Jonson's Hymenai, the same sort of machine was most likely used to effect the discovery and descent of Juno. Shakespeare's text informs us only that "Juno descends" and "her peacocks fly amain"(IV,i,73-74). However, there are four crucial points in Shakespeare's text which support the argument that an Italianate cloud machine was used in the 1611 production of the play.

First, there are twenty-seven lines of verse between the stage direction "Juno descends"(IV,i,73), and Ceres' acknowledgement that "Great Juno comes"(IV,i,101-102), which heralds Juno's first speech. In Hymenai, as has been cited, a song was sung while the eight faculties were descending. The song in Hymenai is only eleven lines long, but I would suggest that it was similar in purpose to Shakespeare's verses in The Tempest. Both Jonson and Shakespeare had to accommodate the

time it took for the cloud machine to open and descend.

Second, just as Hymenai's scene "was all of clouds" before the discovery of Juno, so too The Tempest was provided with at least one cloud, Trinculo's "yond same black cloud, yond huge one"(II,ii,20-21). The demonstrative power of Trinculo's statement has already been discussed. It is apparent now that such a cloud was not merely a pictorial addition to the scene, but rather a functional scenic device in itself, which provided the necessary discovery space and descent mechanism for the "queen o' th' sky"(IV,i,70). This "same black cloud" could have split to reveal Juno just as the clouds opened in Hymenai. However, unlike the goddess in Jonson's masque, who remained "in the top," Shakespeare's Juno descends to join in the betrothal celebration, presumably on one of the beams of the cloud machinery.

Third, there are Prospero's words at the conclusion of the entertainment provided to celebrate Ferdinand and Miranda's love, words which suggest an alteration in the basic island scene was effected at this point in the play:

> Our revels now are ended. These our actors,
> As I foretold you, were all spirits, and
> Are melted into air, into thin air:
> And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,
> The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,
> The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
> Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve,
> And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
> Leave not a rack behind.
> (IV,i,148-156).

Prospero's description of the "cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,/ The solemn temples" may be a reference to a glorious

sky scene, painted to create "a most majestic vision," discovered when the cloud descended. It could have appropriately represented Juno's sky kingdom, like that designed by Jones for Jonson's Hymenai. Many scholars have interpreted "the great globe" to mean the public Globe theatre. However, above Juno, in Jonson's Hymenai, "the region of fire with a continual motion was seen to whirl circularly,"[24] obviously a representation of the sun.[25] In The Tempest masque, "the great globe" may also have represented the sun, revealed after the cloud split. It is this exposed "globe" or sun which inherits the action of the rest of the play.

Finally, at the end of the masque, the goddesses and dancers "heavily vanish," "to a strange, hollow, and confused noise"(IV,i,139). As the "confused noise" of the shipwreck scene would have been an integral part of a scene change, so the "confused noise" at the end of the betrothal masque would have been an integral part of shifting scenery. In Hymenai the scene is said to have been "drawn again, and all covered with clouds." Presumably the two beams were drawn back up into the gallery and pushed together. In The Tempest, I suggest, the mechanism on which Juno descended would have been similarly raised, but not closed, "the air clearing" and leaving "not a rack behind." In Jonson's masque, the clouds are said to have been made to "swell and ride like the rack." Enid Welsford, in The Court Masque, concurs with Horace Furness's comment in the Variorum edition of The Tempest, that a "rack" means a body of clouds in motion.[26] Prospero's concluding statement, if we assume that the cloud remained split, could be read to mean that "the great globe" and glorious skies which were not to fade until the end of the play, would then "dissolve" like the clouds

of the "insubstantial pageant" or betrothal masque just presented. Indeed, the presence of the sun for the conclusion of the play would be very appropriate in terms of the revelations yet to be made, and have reinforced the theme of enlightenment for Shakespeare's audience. Prospero's statement in Act V, that he "bedimm'd/ The noontide sun" (V,i,41-42), when combined with Alonso's reference that the shipwreck occurred "three hours" before the final scene (V,i,186), similarly supports the argument that the two beams of the cloud machinery were left apart, the "black cloud" split, such that the exposed "globe" remained above the actors until the final sentence of the play. Thus The Tempest would have followed the convention of the masque, darkness giving way to light as harmony replaced discord.

During the masque itself, after Iris, Juno, and Ceres have blessed the betrothed couple, Iris calls forth the "Naiads, of the windring brooks"(IV,i,128) or "Nymphs"(IV,i,134), to dance "on this green land"(IV,i,130) with the "sunburn'd sicklemen"(IV,i,134) or "Reapers"(IV,i,139). In all the masques presented before 1611, the climactic moment was celebrated by one or several dances, performed on the carpeted dancing place erected in the hall immediately in front of the main acting stage. In Jonson's Oberon, "the lesser fays [fairies] dance forth their dance," then "Oberon and the knights dance out the first masque dance," after which "they danced forth their second masque dance;" then "followed the measures, corantos, galliards, etc.," until finally "they danced their last dance into the work; and with a full song...the whole machine ['scena ductilis' scene] closed."[27] The fairies' dancing is in sharp contrast to the antics of the satyrs at the beginning of Oberon. Similarly, Shakespeare's Nymphs and Reapers

must have performed, as the stage direction states, "a graceful dance" (IV,i,139), one unlike the grotesqueries of the banquet-table Shapes, one which represented the order and harmony to be associated with the union of Ferdinand and Miranda.

The costumes of the Nymphs and Reapers must have contributed to the overall effect of harmony. The Nymphs, associated with "brooks," were probably attired like those of Tethys' Festival, not unlike Ariel, though one would conjecture less beautifully. The stage direction explicitly mentions that the Reapers are "properly habited"(IV,i,139), which from Iris's words we know meant at least "rye-straw hats"(IV,i, 136). Bernice Freeman asserts that both English and Italian rustics wore similar clothes,[28] which suggests suitable costumes could easily have been provided for The Tempest. These costumes would have been thus traditionally representative of fertility and harvest, again reinforcing the idea of harmony.

Prospero's "Well done! avoid; no more"(IV,i,142), are clearly his words when he "starts suddenly, and speaks"(IV,i,139), and which conclude the masque, as the goddesses, nymphs, and reapers vanish and the cloud machine is lifted from the scene. The philosophical meaning of Prospero's "Our revels now are ended" speech has always been clear, and is not negated but rather enriched by a reading of Shakespeare's famous words based on the theatre technology of the Jacobean court stage. John Russell Brown, who thinks that the goddesses were played by youths, asserts that "the metre, elaborate address, verbal decoration, godlike behaviour, and, probably, the clear tone of boys' voices and use of stage machinery, all help to create a contrastingly rich and assured illusion for the masque."[29] Stephen Orgel asserts that

"it is clear enough what the masque is doing," for "the play is at this point moving away from the island and back to civilization. The natural bounty of the island has up to this point been presented entirely in Caliban's terms. Now the masque gives us Prospero's terms."[30] Prospero's masque is an indication of the kind of universal order that motivates his very principled actions. It seems fitting that Shakespeare's magician should choose an art form which was generated out of a desire to depict harmony governing misrule, and which coincided so directly with the tastes of the Jacobean court.

After the masque is over, Prospero commands Miranda and Ferdinand to "retire into [his] cell,/ And there repose"(IV,i,161-162), where they remain until he discovers them "playing at chess" in the last scene of the play (V,i,172). This discovery is Prospero's final revelation, "a wonder" devised "to content" Alonso and his entourage (V,i,170). The "wonder" is, of course, Alonso's supposed drowned son, Ferdinand. The shipwrecked king hopes he is not seeing another "vision of the island"(V,i,176). The words "wonder" and "vision" suggest that the discovery of the lovers is to be associated with the banquet-table scene and the betrothal masque, as the third in a series of spectacles. It is significant that this final "wonder" is so unspectacular, that Alonso's "vision" is so palpably human. Prospero has discased himself, abjured his "rough magic"(V,i,50), and now the "most high miracle"(V,i,177) he can present is one of human effort. Prospero probably effected the discovery by drawing a curtain placed over the entrance to his cell. We cannot know whether the lovers were seated on practical chairs, but a chessboard and chess pieces must have been placed between them on a table of some sort, in order that the

audience might see them playing the game. Certainly the final discovery included no spectacular element, for here Shakespeare puts theatrical art into its proper place.

Yet the chess scene has its own special meaning. Delmar Solem asserts that "an examination of the extant rules for playing Chess reveals that the game has remained unchanged since about 1475, when Caxton translated Jacobus de Cessolis' The Game and Play of Chesse,"[31] and goes on to say that "although careful study of The Tempest in relation to Chess fails to clarify the lines, the game accompanies the 'discovery' of the lovers to support the conventional usage of Chess for a love scene. Dramatically, Chess seems not a royal game requiring skill and intelligence, but a metaphor, a conceit, a conventional play on various aspects of love through the terminology of Chess."[32] Certainly the "discovery" seems to adhere to this convention, but as a symbolic representation of order and "fair play," which Miranda says will always be her opinion of Ferdinand's actions (V,i,175), the chess game is appropriate to the overall situation of The Tempest, reinforcing the theme of misrule dissolved and discord brought to justice in the minds of Shakespeare's audience.

Miranda says of the assembled courtiers:

> O wonder!
> How many goodly creatures are there here!
> How beauteous mankind is! O brave new world,
> That has such people in't!
> (V,i,181-184).

Clearly Shakespeare here intends us to understand that above the grotesquerie of antimasques, the staged glory of masques, and the new,

amazing technology of the theatre, must be placed the simple but most powerful "wonder," namely, mankind. For Miranda, the magical island has ceased to exercise its power as civilization establishes itself, spirits are replaced by men, and theatrical art gives way to reality. The antimasque of distorted Shapes and the masque of artificial splendor have been succeeded by human beings. Shakespeare's arrangement of the antimasque, masque, and discovery in sequence allows us to realize the emphasis of the last "wonder." Miranda's crucial statement gains much force and depth when we consider that a masque-like production of The Tempest was effected on the evening of 1 November 1611, for Shakespeare, it appears, did not ignore but rather exploited and manipulated the technology of the new court stage in his play in order to reaffirm his belief in man.

Did the Whitehall Banqueting House performance of The Tempest on 1 November 1611 include such costumes and scenic devices as have been suggested in this and the previous chapter? I have argued that the expectations of the Jacobean court, the choice of the Whitehall Banqueting House as venue, the availability of new Italianate technology through the efforts of Jones and the publication of Serlio, and certain analogous staging effects common to both masques and The Tempest, plus the apparent philosophical apprehension of the masque by Shakespeare in his play, combine to support the view that The Tempest received such a masque-like production. The final argument for a hypothesis in favour of a masque-like presentation rests in the person of Shakespeare's magician, Prospero, to whom we turn in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE: PROSPERO, THE PRIME DUKE

Prospero functions as the hero of Shakespeare's The Tempest both as a magician, defined in terms of Renaissance science and theology, and as a masque-presenter, the producer of much theatrical art. He must be critically re-evaluated in the light of Fraces Yates's assertion that he embodies "not only the Magus as philosopher and as the all-powerful magician ushering the scientific age about to dawn, but also the Magus as creator of the theatre and its magic."[1] An examination of Prospero's actions in The Tempest reveals him to be both magician and stage technician, but it must be remembered that in the end he chooses to divest himself of his magic powers forever. The conclusion of the play marks the reestablishment of human values.

It is important, at this point, to distinguish between occult magic and theatrical effect. Both cause their "audience" to experience

wonder, yet while the former relies on supernatural powers, the latter is a result of human effort. Prospero's powers are clearly those of a cabalist magus, but the banquet-table scene and betrothal masque include mechanical devices designed and executed by men. In one sense, the machinery of the theatre may be seen as a metaphor for occult magic, since both are capable of wonderful effects. However, in The Tempest, Shakespeare links theatrical effect with magic through Prospero. It is this combination of the two which forces Prospero to abandon the spectacular theatrical machinery along with his "rough magic"(V,i,50), for theatrical devices are, by Shakespeare's implication, as "evil" as the occult magic which surrounds them. According to D.G. James, Prospero's final action embodies "the mind of European civilization casting off the shackles, and the false hopes, and the terrors of magical daemonology,"[2] for "now, in the writings of Shakespeare, we see the farewell of the human imagination to magic and all its ways."[3] I suggest that Prospero's denunciation of his "rough magic" is equalled by the human effort involved in the discovery of Ferdinand and Miranda, an effort which demonstrates Shakespeare's abandonment of excessively artificial theatrical effects. In having Prospero's magic include theatrical art, Shakespeare is able to state his position on the lavish displays characteristic of the masques presented on the Jacobean court stage.

The key to the figure of Prospero lies, perhaps, in the persons of two men, the Elizabethan magician-scientist, John Dee, and the Jacobean theatre designer, Inigo Jones. Dee's knowledge of theatrical architecture and practice, and his understanding of the occult power of magic, are combined in his Preface to Euclid of 1570, where

"Perspectiue" and "Thaumaturgike" hold equal sway. For Dee, "Thaumaturgike" is a valuable but mechanical part of a world view which also includes demons and the cabal. Indeed his Preface discusses both demons and mechanics in one system of knowledge, at the basis of which is mathematics. Unlike Dee is Inigo Jones, who travels from mathematics to theatrical effect without magic. In The Tempest, Prospero's magic is both occult and, in actual effect, mechanical. The combination of the occult and the mechanical would seem to reflect Dee's Platonic, mathematical thought system. The effects wrought by Prospero's magic certainly incorporate the mechanical devices deployed first by Inigo Jones in the Whitehall Banqueting House.

There are three reasons for linking Prospero with Dee and Jones. First, Yates has strongly suggested that Burbadge must have known Dee's writings on architecture, which allows us to make the initial, if hypothetical, connection between Shakespeare and the magical science of the Italian Renaissance. John Shute had already included much on Vitruvius in The First and Chief Grovndes of Architectvre of 1563, but Dee's contribution is more significant in that the Preface offers an entire system of knowledge, one highly derivative of Italian thought in general. Burbadge, as an architect in his own right, must have read Shute and Dee, and thereby been aware of their philosophical and practical attitudes towards magic and science.

Second, there appears to be a strong link between Marsilio Ficino's view of magic and that of Shakespeare. Dee is credited with adding the Hermetic Ficino and Cabalist Pico della Mirandola to England's intellectual Renaissance by means of his library, which he shared with such distinguished Elizabethans as Sidney and Leicester.

That Prospero's motivation is based on love cannot be denied, for all his art is aimed at reconciliation and the marriage of Miranda and Ferdinand. In his Commentary on Plato's Symposium, in a discussion of love, Ficino asks "Why is love called a magus?", answering, "because all the force of magic consists in love."[4] The writings of Ficino were a basic source for Dee, and it is perhaps through Dee himself that Shakespeare found the motivating principle for Prospero's actions.

Finally, linking Shakespeare with the art of Inigo Jones, there is Ben Jonson. Of course, the lutenist Robert Johnson provides the essential connection between the production of Oberon and that of The Tempest in 1611. However, Jonson's admiration and respect for Shakespeare, his work for the King's Men at Blackfriars, and, perhaps, his meetings with Shakespeare at the Mermaid Tavern, indicate an even closer connection between Shakespeare and Jones, whose practical application of Vitruvian and Serlian theories in productions of Jonson's masques must have had some influence on Shakespeare's stage-craft. It is not surprising, then, that Shakespeare derives his picture of a magician in The Tempest from the magus, Dee, and the technician, Jones.

John Dee was born in 1527, died in 1608, and during his life became most famous for the acquisition of his large and valuable library. Antonia McLean asserts that

> Dee's house at Mortlake, where he had three laboratories, a great quantity of astronomical instruments, and above all his library of books and manuscripts, became the focal point of all scientific advance in mathematical and allied subjects in the first half of the reign of Elizabeth...[for] Dee placed his library and his knowledge at the disposal of all who came to seek it, and included among his pupils ordinary seafaring men and

technicians as well as the aristocratic Dudleys and Philip Sidney.[5]

Dee possessed over 2,600 books and manuscripts,[6] which incorporated, as Yates affirms, "the Renaissance as interpreted by Ficino and Pico della Mirandola, with its slant towards philosophy, science and magic, rather than towards purely grammarian humanistic studies."[7] Dee was well versed in Renaissance science and magic, though not necessarily for the evil purposes some Elizabethans thought.

In 1564 Dee published his Monas hieroglyphica in Antwerp, which involved the explication of a special "monad" or talismanic sign. Dee's desire may have been similar to Ficino's, whose purpose was, D.G. James asserts,

> to defend the forms of astrological magic, using talismanic signs and images to draw down divine influence and power from the spheres and stars, and to avoid any charge of trafficking with daemons. But the result was confused and uncertain enough [in Ficino's work]. The result was still more confused in the writings of Pico della Mirandola, who brought into the picture Cabalist magic, which might allow of commerce with angels, to supplement Ficino's astrological magic. In his mind, as in Ficino's, there was an overriding sense of the difference between the magic that was evil and daemonic and that which properly belonged to a Christian magus who might by charm and sign, music and incantation, draw down the influence of sphere and star for the divinization of the human soul.[8]

Not only in his Monas hieroglyphica, but also in his posthumously published Diary, Dee expresses a desire to be able to speak with angels and thus acquire divine knowledge.[9] After the publication of the Monas hieroglyphica, Elizabeth I asked Dee to explain his talismanic sign, for she had had to defend him against those who

disliked the artifical magic, Cabala, and religious Hermeticism basic to his monad.[10]

In his Preface to Euclid of 1570, Dee digresses from his presentation of the various scientific arts to defend his work against such detraction. He asks why, for "maruelous Actes and Feates, Naturally, Mathematically, and Mechanically wrought and contriued: ought any honest Student, and Modest Christian Philosopher, be counted & called a Coniurer?"[11] Furthermore, "He that seketh (by S. Paules aduertisement) in the Creatures Properties, and wonderfull uertues, to find iuste cause, to glorifie the Aeternall: and Almightie Creator by: Shall that Man, be (in hugger mugger) condemned, as a Companion of Helhoundes, and a Caller and Coniurer of wicked and damned Spirites."[12] Dee expected the reader of his Preface to comprehend the mathematical source of all science. His writing was intended to exert an influence, McLean asserts, "not so much on the Court as on the growing class of technologists and artizans,"[13] which would have included Burbadge. For Dee, the Preface was not evil magic, but rather inspirational science. Dee counsels his readers to study Vitruvius, saying that if you would "take his boke in your hand, and slightly loke thorough it, you would say straight way: This is...the Storehouse of all workmanship."[14]

In spite of these appeals to his reader on behalf of science, there is much in Dee's Preface which smacks of magic and the occult. Dee postulates that "All thinges which are & haue beyng, are found vnder a triple diuersitie generall. For, either they are demed Supernaturall, Naturall, or, of a third being. Thinges Supernaturall, are immaterial, simple, indiuisible, incorruptible, & vnchangeable.

Things Naturall, are materiall, compounded, diuisible, corruptible, and chaungeable."[15] Things "of a third being" are thing mathematical, which "can be studied by both the intellect and perception of man."[16] D.G. James, speaking of the elemental, celestial, and intellectual worlds of Agrippa, from whose De occulta philosophia Dee appears to have derived much of his thought, asserts that "the magus is he who seeks to ascend up through all three worlds to the Creator whose divine power he will secure."[17] Dee shared this interpretation of the role of the magus.

Agrippa's work included Vitruvius's figure of a man inscribed within a square and a circle.[18] Dee, in the midst of a discussion of the circle as it relates to "Perspectiue" and man as defined by "Anthropographie," counsels his readers to "Look in Vitruvius, whether I deale sincerely for your behoufe, or no."[19] Dee specifically refers here to "Lib. 3. Cap. I.,"[20] which, in Vitruvius, is the chapter "On Symmetry: In Temples and In The Human Body," wherein the Roman asserts that "just as the human body yields a circular outline, so too a square figure may be found from it."[21] Dee's Preface, then, includes both occult magic and Vitruvian science, though the emphasis is on the latter, unlike his Monas hieroglyphica, which is more magical. However, in his later years, Dee began to abandon objective science and concentrate on the Hermetic and Cabalistic arts in order to acquire a more universal knowledge. He died in 1608, having lost much respect and wealth, forced to sell books from his library in order to eat.

The link between John Dee and Prospero is not only a result of Burbadge's and Jones's possible acquaintance with the scientist's writings, an acquaintance first suggested by Frances Yates and

supported by Antonia McLean.[22] Perhaps Shakespeare himself read the great doctor and profited by the experience. Certainly Shakespeare must have heard of Dee and his library, for Dee was a man of great reputation throughout England. Prospero is, furthermore, reminiscent of Dee in several respects, just as certain theatrical effects he performs in The Tempest are reminiscent of Jones's masque productions. Specifically, Prospero's preoccupation with his library, his capacity for theatrical magic, and his practice of the occult, all suggest John Dee.

Prospero asserts that he abandoned the administration of Milan because his "library/ Was dukedom large enough"(I,ii,109-110). When being exiled, Prospero was furnished from his "own library with volumes" that he prized above his "dukedom," by the kind Gonzalo (I,ii, 166-168). Prospero indicates the very nature of his books when he calls himself a student of "the liberal Arts" often "transported/ And rapt in secret studies"(I,ii,73-77). Prospero's magic power comes from one of his books. The emphasis placed by Shakespeare on Prospero's library does not merely indicate his scientific and magical knowledge, but also strongly implies the connection with John Dee.

Dee acquired early a reputation as an evil conjurar, as a result of his interest in "Thaumaturgike," defined in the Preface as "that Art Mathematicall, which giueth certaine order to make straunge workes, of the sense to be perceiued, and of men greatly to be wondred at."[23] The Queen's defense of his "monad" and his self-justification in the Preface do not mark Dee's first confrontation with the accusation of magician-sorcerer. In 1547, Dee produced Aristophanes' Pax at Trinity College, Cambridge, arousing alarm among

the audience, which was unfamiliar with new Italianate theatre machinery.[24] Dee writes: "Hereupon I did sett forth (and it was seene of the University) a Greeke comedy of Aristophanes...with the performance of the Scarabaeus, his flying up to Jupiter's pallace, with a man and his basket of victuals on her back; whereat was great wondring, and many vaine reportes spread abroad of the meanes how that was effected."[25] Dee was not practicing evil magic in his production, as his audience thought, but rather was indulging in theatrical art, using a stage machine unknown to English eyes. Nevertheless, the effect was astonishing. Yates asserts that Dee represents "a tradition both mystical, magical, and Hermetic, and also scientific, technological, and Vitruvian...to which a growing interest in stagecraft would have looked for advice and assistance."[26]

In The Tempest, Prospero presents Juno flying in a cloud machine down to the stage floor, by some "vanity" of his "Art" (IV,i,41). The effect visually was unlike Dee's, though similar to that created by Jones for Jonson's Hymenai and the descent of Juno's eight faculties. Whereas Dee's audience considered his display as one of real magic, Jones's more enlightened audience was aware of the potential of stage machinery. However, the Jacobean court would at least have considered Jones's spectacular effect equally amazing, though the cause was scientific, in the Vitruvian sense. The Tempest's banquet-table and betrothal masque would also have seemed amazing, though effected by "theatrical devices," like those Dee suggests are possible through "Thaumaturgike," like those Jones was constantly integrating into his masque productions. The important factor, however, is that Shakespeare includes these theatrical effects as an essential part of Prospero's

magic. Thus they become indistinguishable from those aspects of his art which are truly occult.

When Prospero commands Ariel to make himself "like a nymph o' th' sea," he says to the spirit: "Go take this shape,/ And hither come in't"(I,ii,301-305). It almost sounds as if Prospero is handing Ariel the appropriate costume. Jan Kott has suggested that if Prospero is viewed as the producer or designer of theatrical effect, Ariel becomes "both an agent-provocateur and the stage-manager of the performance produced by Prospero."[27] Certainly Prospero as creator of theatrical special effects has more in common with Inigo Jones than with John Dee, who was not as much associated with the theatre. Furthermore, Jones's effects were never accused of being carried out by evil and unnatural magical powers. However, Shakespeare does not distinguish between the mechanical and the occult in his presentation of Prospero's powers. From the audience's point of view, then, Prospero may not be acquitted of the charge of magician or conjurer with respect to those aspects of his "Art" which are a result of theatre technology, for they are directly connected with feats which clearly demonstrate the magician's supernatural powers. His magic staff, robes, and book allow him to command spirits, humans, and elements. He creates initially the terrible storm which gives the play its title. The hypnotic sleep undergone by Miranda (I,ii,185), the courtiers (II,i, 182-194), and the sailors (V,i,230-231), is not a result of theatrical engineering, but of magic charm. Prospero's control over Ariel, Caliban, and the other Shapes and Spirits, is a product of unnatural or supernatural power. The magic circle drawn in Act V is further evidence of the occult powers of the hero of <u>The Tempest</u>, as will be

demonstrated.

Initially it would seem, as Martin Holmes points out, that "a magician with a familiar spirit is not a very suitable character for the King's Men to introduce upon their stage when the King they serve has himself published a tract against such persons and their practices. Prospero the wizard, with a book of spells and an attendant fairy, would savour of dangerous dealings with the Devil."[28] Like John Dee, who mixed magic with objective science, Shakespeare's Prospero would have been susceptible to the accusation of "conjurer." In Cowel's Law Dictionary of 1607, published a year before Dee's death, conjuration is defined as "the exercise of command over evil spirits," as distinct from witchcraft, which necessitated a contract with the Devil.[29] D.G. James concludes that "Ariel is a daemon, or tetrarch, of the air; he is intelligible only in the light of the long history of European daemonology; but...is too human to find a true place in the records of European daemonology."[30] Prospero's dealings with the fiery spirit, who is never referred to as any sort of angel, clearly define his magic as evil. However, before we judge his powers, we must examine the attitude of the Jacobeans towards magicians and the occult.

King James I, a most representative Jacobean, in his Daemonologie, published in 1597, was quite explicit in his condemnation of all magicians. The King's treatise is written in the form of a dialogue between the ignorant Philomathes, who defends the right of Christian Princes to "ouer-see Magicians to liue within their dominions," taking "delight to see them prooue some of their practicques,"[31] and the knowledgeable Epistemon, who asserts with finality that all such

practicers "ought to be put to death according to the Law of God, the ciuill and imperial Law, and municipall law of all Christian nations... by fire."[32]

The King distinguishes between magicians and witches through the following words of Philomathes, with which Epistemon agrees:

> For where the Magicians, as allured by curiositie, in the most parte of their practises, seeke principallie the satisfying of the same, and to winne to themselues a popular honoure and estimation: These Witches on the other parte, being intised ether for the desire of reuenge, or of worldy riches, their whole practises are either to hurte men and their gudes, or what they possesse, for satisfying of their cruell mindes in the former, or else by the wracke in quhatsoeuer sorte, of anie whome God will permitte them to haue power off, to satisfie their greedie desire in the last poynt.[33]

Prospero's preoccupation with the volumes of his library reflects the curiosity James suggests to be characteristic of magicians. Certainly Prospero does not seek worldly riches, and the revenge motif is quickly dispersed in the play as the magician demonstrates his desire for a reconciliation through Miranda and Ferdinand. Unlike Prospero was Caliban's vengeful mother Sycorax, the "damn'd witch" who "in her most unmitigable rage,/ Into a cloven pine" imprisoned Ariel for refusing to obey her (I,ii,263-281). Prospero, then, is clearly a magician and not a witch.

Nevertheless, Prospero's desire for occult knowledge would have been regarded as a sin by Shakespeare's audience. James I defines "Curiosity" as "onelie the inticement of Magiciens or Neocromancers,"[34] and resoundingly condemns those who "are at last entised, that were lawfull artes or sciences failes, to satisfie their restles

mindes, euen to seeke to that black and unlawfull science of Magie."[35] Prospero as magician possesses illegitimate powers.

The King expresses particular concern with the use of magic circles by conjurers and magicians. C.J. Sisson, attempting to exonerate Prospero's magic, forgetting that "circle which Prospero had made" for the shipwrecked courtiers to stand in (V,i,58), asserts that Shakespeare's hero "does not draw circles."[36] Sisson tries to define Prospero's magic as "white," and acceptable. However, James I denounces all circles drawn by magicians, "made triangular, quadrangular, round, double or single, according to the forme of apparition they craue," saying, "to speake of the diuerse formes of the circles, of the innumerable characters and crosses that are within and without, and out-through the same, of the diuerse formes of apparitiones, that that craftie spirit [the Devil] illudes them with, and of all such particulars in that action, I remit it to ouer-manie that haue busied their heades in describing of the same; as being but curious, and altogether vnprofitable."[37] Prospero's circle seems derivative of both the acceptable geometrical Vitruvian circle, with the man inscribed within it, and the magic circle of Cabalistic evil, which was devised to capture evil spirits. The courtiers within the circle are thus simultaneously to be associated with "prisoners"(V,i,9) and "beauteous mankind"(V,i,183). However, the drawing of the circle is an evil act committed by a magician.

Equally evil is Prospero's command over dead men. He refers to "graves" having opened at his command, "wak'd their sleepers, op'd, and let 'em forth"(V,i,48-50). Perhaps we are to understand that Prospero's bestial spirits are the ghosts of dead men. James I's

Daemonologie asserts that such ghosts are really the result of Satan entering dead bodies. The King condemns Satan for deluding magicians by possessing corpses "and there out of to giue such answers, of the euent of battels, of mater concerning the estate of commonwelths, and such like other great questions."[38] According to the definitions and opinions of King James I, Shakespeare's hero is clearly to be condemned for studying and practicing evil magic.

Frances Yates, in Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition, speaking of "the humanist dislike of metaphysical and mathematical studies," asserts that "where there is not understanding of such studies, there arises the ignorant dread of them as all magic."[39] Yates distinguishes between the practical Cabalistic magic of Pico della Mirandola, and the philosophical Hermetic studies of Marsilio Ficino, stating that "Ficino's magic is an infinitely refined and reformed version of pneumatic necromancy," and that "Pico's practical Cabala is an intensely religious and mystical version of conjuring."[40] We are reminded of Ficino's remark that "all the force of magic consists in love," and that Prospero's motivation is based on love. In this only is Prospero's magic exonerated. The magician's motivation is beyond reproach.

Nevertheless, Prospero's method must be condemned. His final decision to cease dabbling in the black arts is probably a result of Shakespeare's awareness of the attitude of Jacobeans towards the practice of magic, as illustrated in James I's Daemonologie. All of Prospero's wonders and visions, whether appearing theatrical or magical in the Whitehall Banqueting House, are grouped together as evidence of his "potent Art," which may be motivated throughout the play by

love, but has its beginning in sinful "curiosity." Evil curiosity begat evil exile, therefore Prospero must assert finally:

> But this rough magic
> I here abjure; and, when I have requir'd
> Some heavenly music, -- which even now I do, --
> To work mine end upon their sense, that
> This airy charm is for, I'll break my staff,
> Bury it certain fadoms in the earth,
> And deeper than did ever plummet sound
> I'll drown my book.
> (V,i,50-57).

Prospero thus abandons his "rough" or evil magic, though not his benign motivation, and resumes his place as rightful Duke of Milan. Miranda's comments on "beauteous mankind" and the "brave new world" that lies before her (V,i,183), mark a return to the civilized human world from the unnatural magical island. The magic robes of the actor portraying Prospero, perhaps elaborately embroidered with talismanic signs and circles, like Dee's monad, are cast off to reveal the ordinary, if magnificent, Duke of Milan.

The magician is replaced by the simple human who draws the curtain to reveal Miranda and Ferdinand playing at chess. Again, the symbolic nature of this important discovery is inherent in Prospero's human effort. The capacity for spectacular, theatrical, mechanical wonders has also been abjured, being an integral part of Prospero's occult powers. Shakespeare would appear to be rejecting the technological display of Jones's masques, just as he rejects the magic of Dee and the Italian Renaissance thinkers, in favour of humanity. Mankind assumes the place formerly occupied by magic and theatrical effect.

In the Epilogue, the ex-magician requests that since his "charms are all o'erthrown," the audience must release him from his "bands" "With the help of [its] good hands"(Epilogue, 9-10). Repentantly he asks to "be reliev'd by prayer,/ Which pierces so, that it assaults/ Mercy itself, and frees all faults"(Epilogue, 16-18). Certainly Prospero here is both actor hoping his performance was well received, and ex-magician asking for divine forgiveness for having practiced, criminally, the evil arts. James I's reference to the "amendment of the faithful" has been embodied in Prospero's transformation from Magus to man.

Enid Welsford asserts that "harmony, particularly social harmony, is the underlying theme of most of the masquing and pageantry of the Jacobean period," and that "one of the most familiar figures in the masque was Hymen, Hymen regarded not merely as 'the god who sits at wedding feasts,' but also as the god of marriage regarded as a social function, and even as a mystical symbol of national unity or of the harmony of all men with one another."[41] She argues that "in The Tempest, the part of Hymen is played by Prospero," therefore the god does not appear in the betrothal masque.[42] Certainly Prospero emerges as the embodiment of social order, particularly after he has relinquished his unnatural power. At the same time he is the embodiment of what Shakespeare might have called "dramatic order," for he rejects the deployment of spectacular effect in the theatre by his discovery of the lovers. Finally he becomes, as magic and false illusion are cast off, "Prospero the prime Duke"(I,ii,72).

CHAPTER SIX: NO MORE AMAZEMENT

Frances Yates asserts that "the Hermetic philosophers were the technicians in an age in which science was emerging from magic."[1] John Dee, the famous Elizabethan scientist, combined technology and magic in his influential Preface to Euclid, probably studied by Burbadge, perhaps read by Shakespeare. Inigo Jones, implementing along with Robert Fludd and Salomon de Caus the science of Vitruvius, Serlio and Dee, produced lavish, spectacular masques at court as a result of his study. Jones marks, in effect, the English transition from magic to science as stage wonders were replaced by wonderful stage technology.

Shakespeare, as a playwright, actor and producer for the King's Men must have been aware of the spectacular mechanical innovations made by Jones in the Whitehall Banqueting House before James I and

his court. This Jacobean audience could hardly have been satisfied any longer with a bare stage and a few emblematic devices, nor would ordinary costumes provide the illusion necessary to attract the court eye. The interior of the Whitehall Banqueting House, specifically designed for masque productions, demanded Serlian lighting techniques and bright dress. The position of the stage at the northern end of the Banqueting House demanded a canvas or flat to hide the gallery pillars and to provide a tiring room for the actors. In the masque productions such a covering was usually painted with a perspective scene. By 1611, Shakespeare was writing for both the open-air public Globe and the covered private Blackfriars, and could not have ignored the changes being made annually in stage technology. Adapting to the new theatrical environment created at court, Shakespeare included many special effects in The Tempest meant to exploit the new science for his own philosophical ends. The Tempest was designed to meet the expectations of the Jacobean court audience accustomed to the display of the masque, with its underlying theme of harmony ruling discord. Prospero, as magician and masque-presenter, would have embodied more than any other Shakespearean character the essence of the theatrical Renaissance instigated by Dee and Jones.

Shakespeare, then, has combined effectively both stage science and supernatural magic in The Tempest. However, the charms, book, staff, robes, and circle which represent Prospero's magical powers are ultimately rejected, as Ariel is freed and Shakespeare demonstrates his awareness of the need to abandon superstition and evil in a civilized, harmonious world. Most crucial is the simultaneous rejection of the new theatrical technology incorporated into the play

as evidence of Prospero's occult powers, for it represents Shakespeare's placing into ethical perspective the spectacle of music, dance, costume, scenery, and machines characteristic of the "insubstantial pageant" that was the Jacobean court masque. The theme of The Tempest as presented in the Whitehall Banqueting House on the evening of 1 November 1611 was very similar to that of all Shakespearean drama: the unadorned and true beauty of mankind.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE: ART TO ENCHANT

1 Peter Cunningham, Extracts From The Accounts of Revels at Court (London: F. Shoberl for The Shakespeare Society, 1842), p. 210.

2 Frank Kermode, "Introduction," in William Shakespeare, The Tempest, ed. Frank Kermode (London: Methuen, 1964), p. xxi. All quotations from the play are from this edition and are cited according to act, scene, and line. Stage directions are cited according to the line which follows them.

3 E.M.W. Tillyard, "The Tragic Pattern"[1938], in Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook, ed. D.J. Palmer (London: Macmillan, 1968), pp. 122-129.

4 E.K. Chambers, "The Integrity of The Tempest," in Shakespearian Gleanings (Oxford: Univ. Press, 1944), pp. 76-97; p. 77.

5 Kermode, "Introduction" to the Arden The Tempest, p. xxiii.

6 Henry James, "Introduction to The Tempest"[1907], in Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook, pp. 79-95; p. 80.

7 Ashley H. Thorndike, "Influence of the Court Masque on the Drama: 1608-1615," PMLA 15 (1900), 114-120; p. 119.

8 Ernest Law, "Shakespeare at Whitehall," London Topographical Record 7 (1912), 31-48; p. 35.

9 M.C. Bradbrook, Elizabethan Stage Conditions: A Study of their Place in the Interpretation of Shakespeare's Plays [1932] (Connecticut: Archon, 1962), p. 31.

10 T.S. Graves, The Court and the London Theatres During the Reign of Elizabeth (Wisconsin: Collegiate Press, Univ. of Chicago, 1913), p. 76.

11 J. Isaacs, "Shakespeare as a Man of the Theatre," in Shakespeare and the Theatre (London: Oxford Univ. Press for the Shakespeare Association, 1927), pp. 88-119; p. 93.

12 Gerald E. Bentley, Shakespeare and His Theatre (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1964), p. 47.

13 C.M. Haines, "The Development of Shakespeare's Stagecraft," in Shakespeare and the Theatre, pp. 35-61; p. 59.

14 G. Wilson Knight, Shakespearian Production (London: Faber and Faber, 1944), p. 30.

15 D.J. Palmer, ed., Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook, p. 12.

16 Enid Welsford, The Court Masque: A Study in the Relationship Between Poetry and the Revels [1927] (New York: Russell and Russell, 1962), p. 336.

17 John Russell Brown, Shakespeare: The Tempest (London: Edward Arnold, 1969), p. 10.

18 William Poel, Some Notes on Shakespeare's Stage and Plays (Manchester: Univ. Press, 1916), pp. 15-16.

19 Glynne Wickham, Shakespeare's Dramatic Heritage: Collected Studies in Medieval, Tudor and Shakespearean Drama (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), p. 142.

20 Ibid., p. 104.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO: GORGEOUS PALACES

1 Percy Simpson, "The Masque," in Shakespeare's England: An Account of the Life & Manners of His Age, In Two Volumes [1916] (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), Vol. II, pp. 311-333; p. 311.

2 Welsford, The Court Masque, p. 117.

3 Glynne Wickham, Early English Stages 1300 to 1600: Volume II, 1576-1660, Part One (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963), p. 89.

4 See Mary Sullivan, Court Masques of Jame I: Their Influence on Shakespeare and the Public Theatres (New York: Knickerbocker, 1913).

5 Paul Reyher, Les Masques Anglais: Etude sur les ballets et la vie de cour en Angleterre (1512-1640) [Paris, 1909] (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1964), p. 58.

6 Welsford, The Court Masque, p. 390.

7 Ibid.

8 See Reyher, Les Masques Anglais, p. 407.

9 See the discussion of dancing in general and compare the various dances in Sir John Davies, "Orchestra," in Silver Poets of the 16th Century, ed. Gerald Bullett (London: Dent & Sons, 1947), pp. 319-342.

10 Glynne Wickham, in Early English Stages II, Part One, pp. 268-274, discusses Jonson's attitude in relation to that of Jones. See also Allardyce Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1938), pp. 22-25, for an analysis of the famous Jonson-Jones quarrel.

11 Vitruvius, The Ten Books on Architecture, trans. Morris Hicky Morgan (Massachusetts: Harvard Univ. Press, 1914).

12 Sebastiano Serlio, The Book of Architecture, trans. Robert Peake [London, 1611]. Facsimile Reprint, intro. A.E. Santaniello (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1970).

13 Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, In Two Volumes (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973), Vol. I, p. 8; Vol. II, p. 823.

14 Lily B. Campbell, Scenes and Machines on the English Stage During the Renaissance: A Classical Revival (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1923), p. 79 re Northumberland. See also, John Shute, The First and Chief Groundes of Architectvre (London: Thomas Marshe, 1563). Shute refers to "the noble and excellent writer Vitruuius one of the most parfaictest of all the Antiques," and to "Sebastianus Serlius, a meruelous conning artificer in our time"(A iv recto), without giving much detail concerning their theories.

15 John Dee, Preface to The Elements of Geometrie of the most auncient Philosopher Evclid of Megara, trans. H. Billingsley (London: John Daye, 1570). Dee speaks of the role of the architect (d iii recto-verso), "Brasen Vessels which in Theatres, are placed by Mathematicall order" for acoustical aid (d iii verso), and "Perspectiue"(b i recto-verso), while offering a complete system of knowledge. His association with Vitruvian and Serlian technology becomes even more apparent as a result of a study of his own work in the theatre, which will be discussed in Chapter Five.

16 Frances A. Yates, Theatre of the World (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), pp. 64-65.

17 Ibid., p. 79.

18 Frances A. Yates, The Rosicrucian Enlightenment (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972), p. 11. See also C.H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson, Ben Jonson, Volume X: Play Commentary, Masque Commentary (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), p. 406: "Inigo Jones probably knew Salomon de Caus' La Perspective, avec la Raison des ombres et miroirs, Ingenieur du serenissime Prince de Galles, Dedie a son Altesse, 1612, with a section on 'Scenography'."

19 John H. McDowell, "Tudor Court Staging: A Study in Perspective," Journal of English and Germanic Philology 44 (1945), 194-207; p. 198.

20 Wickham, Early English Stages II, Part One, p. 275.

21 Campbell, Scenes and Machines, p. 119.

22 Yates, Theatre of the World, p. 109.

23 Ibid., specifically "Chapter VIII: The Stage of the English Public Theatre: The Stage in Robert Fludd's Memory System," pp. 136-161.

24 Yates, Theatre of the World, p. 171.

25 Stephen Orgel, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, p. 7.

26 Leslie Hotson, The First Night of Twelfth Night (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1954).

27 Stephen Orgel, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, p. 7.

28 See Alfred Harbage, Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions (New York: Macmillan, 1952), p. 42, who argues in favor of the use of new techniques at Blackfriars by the King's Men, "either the fixed sets in perspective associated with the 'Serlio stage' or, more probably, the disjunct though practicable canvas houses of the 'simultaneous setting' employed at the Hôtel de Bourgogne in Paris and supplied by the Revels Office for play productions at Whitehall."

29 Hotson, The First Night of Twelfth Night, facing p. 136.

30 Ibid., p. 82.

31 Wickham, Early English Stages II, Part One, pp. 268-269.

32 Ibid., p. 273.

33 Glynne Wickham offers a chart summary of the dimensions of various houses for plays, masques, and banquets, on page 155 of his Early English Stages, Volume II 1576-1660, Part Two (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972).

34 See Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, p. 33; and Wickham, Early English Stages II, Part Two, p. 153.

35 Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, p. 35 re Blackness; and Reyher, Les Masques Anglais, pp. 357-358 re Lord's Masque.

36 Orazio Busino, quoted in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, pp. 279-284; p. 282.

37 Ernest Law, Shakespeare's Tempest as Originally Produced at Court (London: Chatto & Windus for the Shakespeare Association, 1922), pp. 5-6.

38 Ibid., p. 6.

39 Wickham, Early English Stages II, Part Two, pp. 162-165. Wickham

includes the Smythson drawing as plate XXVIII in his book's series of illustrations.

40 Ibid., p. 163. See also Lee Mitchell, "The Advent of Scenic Design in England," Quarterly Journal of Speech 23 (1937), 189-197, who asserts that "after 1608 [The Hue and Cry After Cupid] a regular feature of the design [for masques] was the framing arch or 'frontispiece,' which was set on the floor against the forward edge of the stage or upon the platform itself, a few feet back from the front," p. 192.

41 Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, p. 215.

42 Law, Shakespeare's Tempest as Originally Produced at Court, p. 10.

43 Serlio, "The Second Book" of The Book of Architecture, folio 26 verso.

44 Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, p. 135.

45 Law, Shakespeare's Tempest as Originally Produced at Court, p. 10. Note, however, that Law is speaking of £400 in 1922.

46 See Reyher, Les Masques Anglais, who states: "pour paraître lunimeuse, la scène doit dépasser en éclat la salle, si bien éclairée qu'elle puisse être," p. 377.

47 Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Reniassance Stage, pp. 39-44.

48 "Papers of William Trumbull the Elder 1611-1612," cited in Herford and Simpson, Ben Jonson, Volume X, pp. 522-523; p. 522.

49 Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, p. 40.

50 Ibid., p. 43.

51 M.T. Jones-Davies, Inigo Jones, Ben Jonson et le masque (Paris: Marcel Didier, 1967), p. 34.

52 Frank Kermode, "Appendix F: The Music of The Tempest," in the Arden The Tempest, p. 156.

53 Ibid.

54 Serlio, "The Second Book" of The Book of Architecture, folio 26 verso.

55 Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, pp. 63-71.

56 Ben Jonson, Oberon, The Fairy Prince, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, pp. 204-228; p. 206.

57 Ibid., p. 207.

58 Ibid., p. 208.

59 Reyher, Les Masques Anglais, p. 376.

60 Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, p. 57.

61 McDowell, "Tudor Court Staging," p. 204.

62 Wickham, Early English Stages II, Part One, p. 291.

63 E.K. Chambers, "The Court," in Shakespeare's England, p. 105.

64 See Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, p. 155.

65 See Reyher, Les Masques Anglais, p. 391.

66 E.K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, In Four Volumes [1923] (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), Vol. IV, p. 127.

67 Mary Steele, Plays and Masques at Court During the Reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1926), p. 167.

68 Cunningham, Extracts From The Accounts of Revels at Court, pp. viii-ix.

69 Herford and Simpson, Ben Jonson, Volume X, p. 520.

70 See Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, for a similar interpretation of Prospero's "insubstantial," p. 20.

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE: A TEMPESTUOUS NOISE

1 Frank Kermode, "Introduction" to the Arden The Tempest, p. xi.

2 Reyher, Les Masques Anglais, p. 384.

3 Bernice Freeman, "The Costumes of Love's Labour's Lost, Twelfth Night, and The Tempest," Shakespeare Association Bulletin 11 (1936), 93-106; p. 93. See also Law, Shakespeare's Tempest as Originally Produced at Court, p. 19.

4 Peter Cunningham, Extracts From The Accounts of Revels at Court, pages 70 and 84 respectively. See also Frances Shirley, Shakespeare's Use of Offstage Sounds (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1963), p. 16.

5 W.J. Lawrence, Pre-Restoration Stage Studies (Massachusetts: Harvard Univ. Press, 1927), p. 224.

6 See Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, pp. 169-175.

7 Freeman, "The Costumes of...The Tempest," p. 103.

8 Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, p. 156.

9 Ibid., p. 167.

10 Ben Jonson, Lord Haddington's Masque (The Hue and Cry After Cupid), in Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques, ed. Stephen Orgel (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1969), pp. 107-121; p. 115, ll. 220-223.

11 Thomas Campion, Lord's Masque, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, pp. 241-252; p. 244, 11. 204-207.

12 Ben Jonson, Masque of Blackness, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, pp. 88-99 with the Masque of Beauty; p. 90, 11. 68-70.

13 Samuel Daniel, Tethys' Festival, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, pp. 190-201; p. 195, 11. 236-245.

14 Freeman, "The Costumes of...The Tempest," pp. 93-94.

15 Kermode, in the Arden The Tempest," p. 83.

16 Freeman, "The Costumes of...The Tempest," p. 105.

17 Ben Jonson, Masque of Queens, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, pp. 130-153; p. 135, 1. 444.

18 John P. Cutts, "Music and the Supernatural in The Tempest," in Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook, pp. 196-211; p. 209.

19 Reyher, Les Masques Anglais, p. 407.

20 G. Wilson Knight, The Shakespearian Tempest [1932] (London: Methuen, 1964), p. 258.

21 Kermode, in the Arden The Tempest, footnotes "gaberdine" as a "cloak," p. 63; and "moon-calf" as denoting "monstrosity -- formed imperfectly through the influence of the moon," p. 65.

22 See Kermode's "Introduction" to the Arden The Tempest; and H. Littledale, "Folklore and Superstition: Ghosts and Fairies: Witchcraft and Devils," in Shakespeare's England, Vol. I, pp. 516-546; p. 544.

23 Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, pp. 205-207.

24 Shirley, Shakespeare's Use of Offstage Sounds, p. 53.

25 J.R. Brown, Shakespeare: The Tempest, p. 25.

26 Stephen Orgel, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, p. 3.

27 A.M. Nagler, Shakespeare's Stage, trans. Ralph Manheim (Massachusetts: Yale Univ. Press, 1958), p. 104.

28 Law, Shakespeare's Tempest as Originally Produced at Court, pp. 12-13.

29 As Kermode indicates in his footnote to the Arden edition, The Tempest is divided into acts and scenes in the Folio edition of 1623, p. 3.

30 See "a sudden flash of lightning," in Daniel's Tethys' Festival, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, p. 195, l. 317.

31 Serlio, "The Second Book" of The Book of Architecture, folio 26 verso.

32 Jonson, Lord Haddington's Masque, in Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques, p. 108.

33 William A. Armstrong, "Ben Jonson and Jacobean Stagecraft," Jacobean Theatre 13, 43-61; p. 49. See also Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, p. 69.

34 Jonson, Lord Haddington's Masque, in Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques, p. 115.

35 James Shirley, The Triumph of Peace, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. II, pp. 536-565; p. 552, ll. 690-693.

36 Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, p. 43.

37 Compare the descriptions of Webb's designs in Sir William D'Avenant, The Seige of Rhodes, in The Dramatic Works of Sir William D'Avenant, Volume III (New York: Russell & Russell, 1964), pp. 259-

365. Webb, a student of Inigo Jones, designed pictorial backgrounds that were symbolic of the action of the play.

38 Thomas Campion, Lord Hay's Masque, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, pp. 115-121; p. 116, ll. 16-20.

39 Jonson, Masque of Beauty, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, pp. 93-96; p. 94, ll. 146-149.

40 Daniel, Tethys' Festival, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, p. 193, ll. 23-24 and ll.43-46.

41 Jonson, Oberon, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, pp. 206-207.

42 Wickham, Early English Stages II, Part Two, p. 163.

43 Jonson, Oberon, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, p. 207, l. 41.

44 Ibid., p. 207, l. 110.

45 Ibid., p. 209, ll. 259-262.

46 See Wickham, Early English Stages II, Part One, pp. 213-218 on the "mountain" and "cave;" and p. 310 on the "3 Rocks" possessed by one London company.

47 Busino, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, p. 283.

48 Law, Shakespeare's Tempest as Originally Produced at Court, p. 32.

49 Kermode, in the Arden The Tempest, footnote p. 107, speaks of the "line" as "lime" or "linden-trees" which would have been placed onstage.

50 Campion, Lord Hay's Masque, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, p. 116, ll. 19-30.

51 Wickham, Early English Stages II, Part One, pp. 216-217.

52 Ibid., pp. 219-224.

53 See Masque of Blackness, Masque of Beauty, Lord Hay's Masque, Hymenai, Masque of Queens, Tethys' Festival, and Oberon, as reproduced in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR: A MOST MAJESTIC VISION

1 Jonson, Masque of Beauty, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, p. 93, ll. 11-14; p. 94, ll. 98-104.

2 Jonson, Masque of Queens, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, p. 132, ll. 23-33; p. 134, ll. 341-354.

3 Jonson, Oberon, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, p. 207, l. 30.

4 Stephen Orgel, The Jonsonian Masque (Massachusetts: Harvard Univ. Press, 1965), p. 35.

5 Ibid., p. 117.

6 Jonson, Masque of Queens, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, p. 134, ll. 341-346.

7 John C. Adams, "The Staging of The Tempest, III,iii," Review of English Studies 14 (1938), 404-419; p. 405.

8 Ibid., p. 413.

9 Ivor Brown, Shakespeare and the Actors (London: The Bodley Head, 1970), p. 22.

10 Martin Holmes, Shakespeare's Public: The Touchstone of His Genius (London: John Murray, 1960), p. 219.

11 Wickham, Early English Stages II, Part Two, p. 164; discussion pp. 162-165.

12 Samuel Daniel, The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses, ed. Joan Rees, in A Book of Masques: In Honour of Allardyce Nicoll (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1967), pp. 17-42.

13 Jonson, Hymenai, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, pp. 104-113; p. 108, l. 210.

14 Francis Beaumont, The Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn, in The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher, In Two Volumes, ed. Rev. Alexander Dyce (New York: Appleton, 1890), Vol. I, pp. 377-382; p. 379.

15 Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, p. 155.

16 Daniel, The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses, in A Book of Masques: In Honour of Allardyce Nicoll, p. 28.

17 Ibid., p. 26.

18 Jonson, Hymenai, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, p. 108, ll. 200-206.

19 Ibid., p. 108, ll. 198-201.

20 Ibid., p. 108, ll. 221-223.

21 Ibid., p. 108, ll. 232-238.

22 Ibid., p. 109, ll. 353-354.

23
Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, p. 66.

24
Jonson, Hymenai, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, p. 108, ll. 207-208.

25
"Globe," in the Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), Vol. IV, F-G, p. 223, is defined as a "fire-ball," citing a 1563 instance which discusses meteors; and as "the sphere of a planet," citing a 1559 instance which refers to the fire of the "globe" of the moon. Certainly the "great globe" would be the fiery sun rather than a meteor or the lesser moon.

26
Welsford, The Court Masque, p. 342. See also, Shakespeare, The Tempest, ed. Horace Howard Furness (New York: Dover, 1892), pp. 215-217.

27
Jonson, Oberon, in Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, Vol. I, p. 209.

28
Freeman, "The Costumes of...The Tempest," p. 105.

29
J.R. Brown, Shakespeare: The Tempest, p. 54.

30
Stephen Orgel, "New Uses of Adversity: Tragic Experience in The Tempest," in Essays in Shakespearean Criticism, ed. James Calderwood and Harold Toliver (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970), pp. 368-387; p. 383.

31
Delmar Solem, "Some Elizabethan Game Scenes," Educational Theatre Journal 6 (1954), 15-21; p. 16.

32
Ibid., p. 19. See also Kermode's footnotes, pp. 122-123, in the Arden The Tempest.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE: PROSPERO THE PRIME DUKE

1
Yates, Theatre of the World, p. 172.

2
D.G. James, The Dream of Prospero (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), p. 174.

3
Ibid., p. 68.

4
Marsilio Ficino, Commentary on Plato's Symposium, trans. Sears Reynolds Jane (Columbia: Univ. of Missouri, 1944), p. 91, states, "Sed cur magum putamus amorem? Quia tota vis magicae in amore consistit." Jane translates this as follows: "But why do we think love is a sorcerer? Because in love there is all the power of enchantment," p. 199. The translation here is my own, since I find Ficino's use of "magicae" more correctly translated as "of magic."

5
Antonia McLean, Humanism and the Rise of Science in Tudor England (London: Heinemann, 1972), p. 134.

6
Lawrence Stone, The Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558-1641 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), p. 705.

7
Yates, Theatre of the World, p. 12.

8
James, The Dream of Prospero, pp. 53-54.

9
John Dee, The Private Diary of Dr. John Dee, ed. J.O. Halliwell (London: Nichols & Son, 1842).

10
J.A. Van Dorsten, The Radical Arts: First Decade of an Elizabethan Renaissance (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1970), p. 22.

11
John Dee, Preface to The Elements of Geometrie of the most auncient Philosopher Euclid of Megara, trans. H. Billingsley, A ii recto.

12
Ibid.

13
McLean, Humanism and the Rise of Science in Tudor England, p. 142.

14
Dee, Preface, d iiii recto.

15
Ibid., i verso.

16
See McLean, Humanism and the Rise of Science in Tudor England, p. 138.

17 D.G. James, The Dream of Prospero, pp. 60-61.

18 See Yates, Theatre of the World, p. 24.

19 Dee, Preface, c iiii recto.

20 Ibid.

21 Vitruvius, The Ten Books on Architecture, p. 73.

22 Yates, Theatre of the World; and McLean, Humanism and the Rise of Science in Tudor England, p. 42.

23 Dee, Preface, A i recto.

24 Yates, Theatre of the World, p. 32.

25 John Dee, cited in Yates, Theatre of the World, pp. 31-32.

26 Yates, Theatre of the World, p. 32.

27 Jan Kott, "Prospero's Staff," in Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook, pp. 244-258; pp. 253-254.

28 Holmes, Shakespeare's Public: The Touchstone of His Genius, p. 217.

29 C.J. Sisson, "The Magic of Prospero," Shakespeare Survey 11 (1958), 70-77; p. 72.

30 D.G. James, The Dream of Prospero, p. 67.

31 King James the First, Daemonologie [1597]. Facsimile Reprint ed. G.B. Harrison (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966), p. 24.

32 Ibid., p. 77.

33 Ibid., pp. 34-35.

34 Ibid., p. 8.

35 Ibid., p. 10.

36 Sisson, "The Magic of Prospero," p. 75.

37 James I, Daemonologie, pp. 17-18.

38 Ibid., p. 20.

39 Frances A. Yates, Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964), p. 167.

40 Ibid., p. 108.

41 Welsford, The Court Masque, p. 397.

42 Ibid., p. 341. See also John M. Major, "Comus and The Tempest," Shakespeare Quarterly 10 (1959), 177-183; pp. 178-179.

NOTES TO CHAPTER SIX: NO MORE AMAZEMENT

1 Yates, Theatre of the World, p. 32.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Beaumont, Francis. The Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn [1613], in The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher, In Two Volumes. Ed. Rev. Alexander Dyce. New York: Appleton, 1890, Vol. I, pp. 377-382.

Campion, Thomas. Lord Hay's Masque [1607], in Orgel, Stephen, and Roy Strong. Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, In Two Volumes. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973, Vol. I, pp. 115-121.

_____. Lord's Masque [1613], in Orgel, Stephen, and Roy Strong. Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, In Two Volumes. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973, Vol. I, pp. 241-252.

Daniel, Samuel. Tethys' Festival [1610], in Orgel, Stephen, and Roy Strong. Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, In Two Volumes. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973, Vol. I, pp. 190-201.

_____. The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses [1604]. Ed. Joan Rees, in A Book of Masques: In Honour of Allardyce Nicoll. Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1967, pp. 17-42.

D'Avenant, Sir William. The Seige of Rhodes [1656], in The Dramatic Works of Sir William D'Avenant. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964, Vol. III, pp. 259-365.

Davies, Sir John. "Orchestra," in Silver Poets of the 16th Century. Ed. Gerald Bullett. London: Dent & Sons, 1947, pp. 319-342.

Dee, John. Preface to The Elements of Geometrie of the Most auncient Philosopher Euclid of Megara. Trans. H. Billingsley. London: John Daye, 1570.

_____. The Private Diary of Dr. John Dee. Ed. J.O. Halliwell. London: Nichols & Son for the Camden Society, 1842.

Ficino, Marsilio. Commentary on Plato's Symposium. Trans. Sears Reynolds Jane. Columbia: Univ. of Missouri, 1944.

James the First of England. Daemonologie [1597]. Facsimile Reprint, ed. G.B. Harrison. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1966.

Jones, Inigo. Festival Designs by Inigo Jones: An Exhibition of Drawings for Scenery and Costumes for the Court Masques of James I and Charles I. New York: International Exhibitions Foundation, 1967-1968.

_____. Inigo Jones on Palladio, Volumes One and Two: Being the Notes by Inigo Jones in the Copy of 'I Quattro Libri Dell Architettura Di Andrea Palladio,' 1601. Oxford: Worcester College, 1970.

Jonson, Ben. Hymenai [1606], in Orgel, Stephen, and Roy Strong. Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, In Two Volumes. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973, Vol. I, pp. 105-113.

_____. Lord Haddington's Masque [1608], in Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques. Ed. Stephen Orgel. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1969, pp. 107-121.

_____. Love Freed From Ignorance and Folly [1610]. Ed. Norman Sanders, in A Book of Masques: In Honour of Allardyce Nicoll. Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1967, pp. 71-93.

_____. Masque at Lord Haddington's Marriage [1608], in Evans, Herbert Arthur. English Masques. London: Blackie & Son, pp. 17-31.

_____. Masque of Beauty [1608], in Orgel, Stephen, and Roy Strong. Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, In Two Volumes. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973, Vol. I, pp. 93-96.

_____. Masque of Blackness [1605], in Orgel, Stephen, and Roy Strong. Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, In Two Volumes. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, Vol. I, pp. 88-99.

_____. Masque of Queens [1609], in Orgel, Stephen, and Roy Strong. Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, In Two Volumes. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973, Vol. I, pp. 130-153.

_____. Oberon, The Fairy Prince [1611]. Ed. Richard Hosley, in A Book of Masques: In Honour of Allardyce Nicoll. Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1967, pp. 43-70.

_____. Oberon, The Fairy Prince [1611], in Orgel, Stephen, and Roy Strong. Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, In Two Volumes. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973, Vol. I, pp. 204-228.

Serlio, Sebastiano. The Book of Architecture. Trans. Robert Peake [London: 1611]. Facsimile Reprint, intro. A.E. Santaniello. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1970.

Shakespeare, William. The First Folio of Shakespeare [1623]. Facsimile Reprint, ed. Charlton Hinman. New York: Norton, 1968.

_____. The Tempest [1611]. Ed. Frank Kermode. London: Methuen, 1964.

_____. The Tempest [1611]. Ed. Horace Howard Furness. New York: Dover, 1892.

Shirley, James. The Triumph of Peace [1634], in Orgel, Stephen, and Roy Strong. Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, In Two Volumes. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973, Vol. II, pp. 536-565.

Shute, John. The First and Chief Grovndes of Architectvre. London: Thomas Marshe, 1563.

Vitruvius. The Ten Books on Architecture. Trans. Morris Hicky Morgan. Massachusetts: Harvard Univ. Press, 1914.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Adams, John C. "The Staging of The Tempest, III,iii." Review of English Studies, 14 (1938), 404-419.

Akrigg, G.P.V. Jacobean Pageant or The Court of King James I. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1962.

Alexander, Peter. Shakespeare's Life and Art. London: James Nisbet, 1939.

Allen, L.H. "The Hypnosis Scene in The Tempest." Australasian Journal of Psychology and Philosophy, 4 (1926), 110-118.

Armstrong, William A. "Ben Jonson and Jacobean Stagecraft." Jacobean Theatre, 13, 43-61.

A Series of Papers on Shakespeare and the Theatre. London: Oxford Univ. Press for the Shakespeare Association, 1927.

Auden, W.H. "Caliban to the Audience"[1945], in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 96-105.

Beckerman, Bernard. Shakespeare at the Globe 1599-1609. New York: Collier, 1962.

Bennet, H.S. "Annual Shakespeare Lecture: Shakespeare's Audience." Read 26 (1944).

Bentley, Gerald Eades, ed. A Book of Masques: In Honour of Allardyce Nicoll. Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1967.

_____. Shakespeare and His Theatre. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1964.

_____. "Shakespeare and the Blackfriars Theatre." Shakespeare Survey, 1 (1948), 38-50.

_____. The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time: 1590-1642. New Jersey: Princeton Univ. Press, 1971.

Beyne, Ronald. "Masque and Pastoral." CHEL, 6 (1910), 328-372.

Boswell, Eleanore. The Restoration Court Stage: 1660-1702. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1965.

Bradbrook, M.C. Elizabethan Stage Conditions: A Study of Their Place in the Interpretation of Shakespeare's Plays. Connecticut: Archon, 1962.

Brower, Reuben A. "The Mirror of Analogy," in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 153-175.

_____. "The Tempest," in Dean, Leonard F., ed. Shakespeare: Modern Essays in Criticism. Revised Edition. Oxford: Univ. Press, 1967.

Brown, Ivor. Shakespeare and the Actors. London: The Bodley Head, 1970.

Brown, John Russell. Shakespeare: The Tempest. London: Edward Arnold, 1969.

Calderwood, James L., and Harold E. Toliver, editors. Essays in Shakespearean Criticism. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Campbell, Lily B. Scenes and Machines on the English Stage During the Renaissance: A Classical Revival. Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1923.

Carrère, Félix. "Le Surnaturel dans La Tempête." Les Langues Modernes, July-Aug. (1950), pp. 252-257.

Chambers, Edmund K. "Court Performances Under James I." Modern Language Review, 4 (1909), 153-166.

_____. Notes on the History of the Revels Office Under the Tudors. London: A.H. Bullen, 1906.

_____. "The Court," in Shakespeare's England: An Account of the Life & Manners of His Age, In Two Volumes [1916]. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966, Vol. I, pp. 79-111.

_____. The Elizabethan Stage, In Four Volumes [1923]. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

_____. "The Integrity of The Tempest," in Shakespearian Gleanings. Oxford: Univ. Press, 1944, pp. 76-97.

_____. William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems, Volume One. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.

Coleridge, S.T. "An Analysis of Act I"[1811], in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 49-61.

_____. "The Moved and Sympathetic Imagination"[1836], in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 62-66.

Cunliffe, John W. "Italian Prototypes of the Masque and Dumb Show." PMLA, 15 (1907), 140-156.

Cunningham, Peter. Extracts From The Accounts of Revels at Court in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I. London: F. Shoberl for the Shakespeare Society, 1842.

_____. "The Life of Inigo Jones," in Inigo Jones and Ben Jonson. London: The Shakespeare Society, 1853.

Cutts, John P. "Music and the Supernatural in The Tempest," in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 196-211.

Davison, Frank. "The Tempest: An Interpretation," in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 212-231.

Dean, Leonard F., ed. Shakespeare: Modern Essays in Criticism. Revised Edition. Oxford: Univ. Press, 1967.

Dobrée, Bonamy. "The Tempest." Essays and Studies, New Series, 5 (1952), 13-26.

Dowden, Edward. "The English Masque," in Essays Modern and Elizabethan. London: Dent & Sons, 1910, pp. 334-350.

_____. "The Serenity of The Tempest"[1875], in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 72-78.

Dryden, John. "The Character of Caliban"[1679], in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, p. 34.

Dunn, Esther Cloudman. Ben Jonson's Art: Elizabethan Life and Literature as Reflected Therein. New York: Russell & Russell, 1963.

Ebisch, Walther, and Levin L. Schücking. A Shakespeare Bibliography. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931.

_____. Supplement for the Years 1930-1935 to A Shakespeare Bibliography. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.

Evans, Herbert Arthur. English Masques. London: Blackie & Son.

Ewen, C. L'Estrange. A Criticism of The Tempest Wreck Scene. London: C. L'Estrange Ewen, 1937.

Feuillerat, Albert, ed. Documents Relating to the Office of the Revels in the Time of Queen Elizabeth. Louvain: A. Uystpruyst, 1908.

Fitz, Linda. "The Vocabulary of the Environment in The Tempest." Paper, now in press, delivered in the Department of English Lecture Series, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, Spring, 1973.

Freeman, Bernice. "The Costumes of Love's Labour's Lost, Twelfth Night, and The Tempest." Shakespeare Association Bulletin, 11 (1936), 93-106.

Granger, Frank. "Introduction," and "Vitruvius and the Craftsmen of Rome," in Vitruvius. On Architecture. London: Heinemann, 1934, pp. ix-xlvii.

Graves, Thornton, Shirley. The Court and the London Theatres During the Reign of Elizabeth. Wisconsin: Collegiate Press, Univ. of Chicago, 1913.

Haines, C.M. "The Development of Shakespeare's Stagecraft," in Shakespeare and the Theatre. London: Oxford Univ. Press for the Shakespeare Association, 1927, pp. 35-61.

Harbage, Alfred. Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions. New York: Macmillan, 1952.

_____. Theatre for Shakespeare. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1955.

Harrison, G.B. Introducing Shakespeare. Middlesex: Penguin, 1959.

Hazlitt, William. "Unity and Variety in Shakespeare's Design"[1817], Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 67-71.

Herford, C.H., and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, editors. Ben Jonson, Volume X: Play Commentary, Masque Commentary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950.

Hewitt, Barnard, ed. The Renaissance Stage: Documents of Serlio, Sabbattini and Furttenbach. Florida: Univ. of Miami Press, 1958.

Hoeniger, F.D. "Prospero's Storm and Miracle." Shakespeare Quarterly, 7 (1956), 33-38.

Holmes, Martin. Shakespeare's Public: The Touchstone of His Genius. London: John Murray, 1960.

Holt, John. An Attempte to Rescue that Aunciente, English Poet, and Playwrighte, Master Williaume Shakespeare [London: 1749]. Facsimile Reprint. New York: AMS Press, 1972.

Hotson, Leslie. "Shakespeare's Arena-Stage at Court." Renaissance Quarterly, 6 (1954), 17-18.

_____. Shakespeare's Wooden O. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1959.

_____. The First Night of Twelfth Night. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1954.

Isaacs, J. "Shakespeare as a Man of the Theatre," in Shakespeare and the Theatre. London: Oxford Univ. Press for the Shakespeare Association, 1927, pp. 88-119.

James, D.G. The Dream of Prospero. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

James, Henry. "Introduction to The Tempest"[1907], in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 79-95.

Jennings, Hargrave. The Rosicrucians: Their Rites and Mysteries, In Two Volumes. London: John C. Nimmo, 1887.

Johansson, Bertril. Religion and Superstition in the Plays of Ben Jonson and Thomas Middleton. Upsala: Almqvist & Wiksels, 1950.

Johnson, Samuel. "Caliban's Language"[1765], in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, p. 48.

Jones-Davies, M.T. Inigo Jones, Ben Jonson et le masque. Paris: Marcel Didier, 1967.

Kelsey, R.M. "Indian Dances in The Tempest." Journal of English and Germanic Philology 13 (1914), 98-103.

Kermode, Frank. "Introduction" and "Appendix F: The Music of The Tempest," in Shakespeare, William. The Tempest. Ed. Frank Kermode. London: Methuen, 1964.

Kernodle, George R. "Perspective in the Renaissance Theatre. The Pictorial Sources and the Development of Scenic Forms." Doctoral Dissertation, Yale University, 1937.

King, T.J. Shakespearean Staging 1599-1642. Massachusetts: Harvard Univ. Press, 1971

Kirschbaum, Leo. "The Tempest -- Apologetics or Spectacle?" Shakespeare Newsletter 8 (1958), 4.

Knight, G. Wilson. Shakespearian Production. London: Faber and Faber, 1944.

_____. "The Shakespearian Superman," in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 130-152.

_____. The Shakespearian Tempest: With a Chart of Shakespeare's Dramatic Universe. London: Methuen, 1964.

Kott, Jan. "Prospero's Staff," in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 244-258.

Lambin, G. "L'Ile de Prospero ou les faux prodiges." Les Langues Modernes, 52 (1958), 37-44.

Law, Ernest. "Shakespeare at Whitehall." London Topographical Record, 7 (1912), 31-48.

_____. Shakespeare's Tempest as Originally Produced at Court. London: Chatto & Windus for the Shakespeare Association, 1922.

Lawrence, W.J. Pre-Restoration Stage Studies. Massachusetts: Harvard Univ. Press, 1927.

_____. The Elizabethan Playhouse and Other Studies. New York: Russell & Russell, 1963.

_____. "The Masque in The Tempest." Fortnightly Review, New Series, 107 (1920), 941-946.

_____. Those Nut-Cracking Elizabethans: Studies of the Early Theatre and Drama. London: Argonaut Press, 1935.

Legouis, P. "Présentation de La Tempête de Shakespeare." Etudes anglaises, 13, 260-263.

Linklater, Eric. Ben Jonson and King James. London: Jonathan Cape, 1931.

Linn, John Gaywood. "The Court Masque and Elizabethan Dramatic Structure, 1558-1604." Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University, 1951.

Littledale, H. "Folklore and Superstitions: Ghosts and Fairies: Witchcraft and Devils," in Shakespeare's England: An Account of the Life & Manners of His Age, In Two Volumes [1916]. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966, Vol. I, 516-546.

Major, John M. "Comus and The Tempest." Shakespeare Quarterly, 10 (1959), 177-183.

McDowell, John H. "Tudor Court Staging: A Study in Perspective." Journal of English and Germanic Philology 44 (1945), 194-207.

McLean, Antonia. Humanism and the Rise of Science in Tudor England. London: Heinemann, 1972.

Mitchell, Lee. "The Advent of Scenic Design in England." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 23 (1937), 189-197.

Murry, J. Middleton. "Shakespeare's Dream," in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 109-121.

Nagler, A.M. Shakespeare's Stage. Trans. Ralph Manheim. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1958.

Neilson, Francis. Shakespeare and The Tempest. New Hampshire: Richard R. Smith, 1956.

Nicoll, Allardyce. Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1938.

Nilan, Mary M. "The Stage History of The Tempest: A Question of Theatricality." DA, 28 (1967), 2217A (Northwestern).

Noble, Richard. "Shakespeare's Songs and Stage," in Shakespeare and the Theatre. London: Oxford Univ. Press for the Shakespeare Association, 1927, pp. 120-133.

Northam, John R. Dividing Worlds. New York: Humanities Press, 1965.

Nuttall, A.D. Two Concepts of Allegory: A Study of Shakespeare's The Tempest and the Logic of Allegorical Expression. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.

Nuzum, David G. "The London Company and The Tempest." West Virginia Philological Papers 12 (1959), 12-23.

Orgel, Stephen. "New Uses of Adversity: Tragic Experience in The Tempest," in Essays in Shakespearean Criticism. Ed. James L. Calderwood and Harold E. Toliver. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970, pp. 368-387.

_____, ed. Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1969.

_____. The Jonsonian Masque. Massachusetts: Harvard Univ. Press, 1965.

Orgel, Stephen, and Roy Strong. Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court, In Two Volumes. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973.

Palme, Per. Triumph of Peace: A Study of the Whitehall Banqueting House. Upsala: Almqvist & Wicksels, 1956.

Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968.

Pevsner, Nikolaus. An Outline of European Architecture. New York: Scribner's, 1948.

Poel, William. Some Notes on Shakespeare's Stage and Plays. Manchester: Univ. Press, 1916.

Rea, John D. "A Source for the Storm in The Tempest." Modern Philology, 17 (1919/20), 279-286.

Reyher, Paul. Les Masques Anglais: Etude sur les ballets et la vie de cour en Angleterre (1512-1640) [Paris: 1909]. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1964.

Reynolds, George F. On Shakespeare's Stage. Ed. Richard Kaub. Boulder: Univ. of Colorado Press, 1967.

_____. Some Principles of Elizabethan Staging [1905]. New York: AMS Press, 1970.

Roaten, Darnell. "Is Shakespeare Baroque? A Study of The Tempest." Langue et Littérature, 6, 324.

Rogers, J.D. "Voyages and Explorations: Geography: Maps," in Shakespeare's England: An Account of the Life & Manners of His Age, In Two Volumes [1916]. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966, Vol. I.

Rowe, Nicholas. "Solemn and Poetical Magic"[1709], in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 35-36.

Shakespeare's England: An Account of the Life & Manners of His Age, In Two Volumes [1916]. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

Shirley, Frances A. Shakespeare's Use of Offstage Sounds. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1963.

Sieveking, A. Forbes. "Dancing," in Shakespeare's England: An Account of the Life & Manners of His Age, In Two Volumes [1916] Oxford: Clarendon Press, Vol. I, pp. 437-450.

Simpson, Percy. "The Masque," in Shakespeare's England: An Account of the Life & Manners of His Age, In Two Volumes [1916] Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966, Vol. II, pp. 311-333.

Simpson, Percy, and C.F. Bell. Designs by Inigo Jones for Masques & Plays at Court: A Descriptive Catalogue of Drawings for Scenery and Costumes mainly in the Collection of His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, K.G.. New York: Russell & Russell, 1966.

Sisson, C.J. "The Magic of Prospero." Shakespeare Survey 11 (1958), 70-77.

Smith, Gordon Ross. A Classified Shakespeare Bibliography, 1936-1958. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State Univ. Press, 1963.

Smith, Hallett, ed. Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Tempest. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Smith, Irwin. "Ariel and the Masque in The Tempest." Shakespeare Quarterly, 21 (1970), 213-222.

_____. "Ariel as Ceres." Shakespeare Quarterly, 9 (1958), 430-432.

Smith, Sharon L. "The Commedia dell' Arte and Problems Related to Source in The Tempest." Emporia State Research Studies 13, 11-23.

Solem, Delmar. "Some Elizabethan Game Scenes." Educational Theatre Journal, 6 (1954), 15-21.

Spencer, Theodore. "Shakespeare and the Nature of Man: The Tempest," in Dean, Leonard F., ed. Shakespeare: Modern Essays in Criticism. Revised Edition. Oxford: Univ. Press, 1967.

Spevack, Marvin. A Complete and Systematic Concordance to the Works of Shakespeare, Volumes IV,V, VI: A Concordance to the Complete Works. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1969-1970.

Sprague, Arthur Colby. The Doubling of Parts in Shakespeare's Plays. London: The Society for Theatre Research, 1966.

Steele, Mary Susan. Plays and Masques at Court During the Reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1926.

Stone, Lawrence. The Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558-1641. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

Styan, J.L. Shakespeare's Stagecraft. Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1967.

Sullivan, Mary. Court Masques of James I: Their Influence on Shakespeare and the Public Theatres. New York: Knickerbocker, 1913.

Thorndike, Ashley H. "Influence of the Court Masques on the Drama: 1608-1615." PMLA, 15 (1900), 114-120.

Tillyard, E.M.W. "The Tragic Pattern," in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 122-129.

Traversi, Derek A. An Approach to Shakespeare, Volume II: From Troilus and Cressida to The Tempest. 3rd Edition: Revised and Expanded. New York: Anchor, 1969.

_____. "The Tempest." Scrutiny, 16 (1949), 127-157.

Van Dorsten, J.A. The Radical Arts: First Decade of an Elizabethan Renaissance. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1970.

Venezky, Alice S. Pageantry on the Shakespearean Stage. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1951.

Walton, Charles E. "The Impact of the Court Masque and the Blackfriars Theatre Upon the Staging of Elizabethan-Jacobean Drama." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Missouri, 1953.

Warton, Joseph. "Amazing Wildness of Fancy"[1753], in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 37-41.

_____. "Remarks on the Creation of Character"[1753], in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 42-47.

Webster, Margaret. Shakespeare Without Tears. New York: Whittlesey House, 1942.

Welsford, Enid. "Italian Influence on the English Court Masque." Modern Language Review, 18 (1923), 394-409.

_____. The Court Masque: A Study in the Relationship Between Poetry and the Revels [1927]. New York: Russell & Russell, 1962.

Wertheim, Albert. "James Shirely and the Caroline Masques of Ben Jonson." Theatre Notebook, 27 (1973), 157-161.

Wickham, Glynne. Early English Stages: 1300 to 1660, Volume II, 1576-1660, Part One. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.

_____. Early English Stages: 1300 to 1660, Volume II, 1576-1660, Part Two. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.

_____. Shakespeare's Dramatic Heritage: Collected Studies in Medieval, Tudor and Shakespearean Drama. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

William, David. "The Tempest on the Stage." Jacobean Theatre, 13, 133-157.

Yates, Frances A. A Study of Love's Labour's Lost. Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1936.

_____. Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.

_____. John Florio: The Life of an Italian in Shakespeare's England. Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1934.

_____. The Art of Memory. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.

_____. Theatre of the World. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

_____. The Rosicrucian Enlightenment. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.

Zimbardo, Rose Alexander. "Form and Disorder in The Tempest," in Palmer, D.J., ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest: A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1968, pp. 232-243.